

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2015

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 10:03 a.m., in room SD-124, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Lisa Murkowski (chairwoman) presiding.

Present: Senators Murkowski, Blunt, Daines, Udall, Leahy, and Tester.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

STATEMENT OF TOM TIDWELL, CHIEF

ACCOMPANIED BY TONY DIXON, DIRECTOR, STRATEGIC PLANNING, BUDGET AND ACCOUNTABILITY

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR LISA MURKOWSKI

Senator MURKOWSKI. Good morning. We will call the hearing to order this morning. We are here today to review the fiscal year 2016 budget request for the Forest Service.

Chief, it is good to have you back before the subcommittee. Thank you.

And I would also like to welcome Mr. Tony Dixon, who serves as the Director of the Office of Strategic Planning, Budget, and Accountability at the Forest Service. He's accompanying the Chief today. Welcome to you as well.

Again, we are going to follow early bird rules here. We will do 6-minute rounds afterward. Hopefully, we will be able to get through all of our questions this morning. I know that other members have other appropriations hearings that we are trying to juggle and run in and out between. So hopefully, we will operate smoothly here and efficiently.

Let's go to the budget request itself. The Forest Service has asked for \$4.93 billion for fiscal year 2016. That is 2.7 percent or \$130 million less than the current enacted level. The Forest Service has also requested an additional \$854 million in mandatory spending for the proposed fire cap adjustment.

I am pleased that the request maintains the increases the subcommittee included last year for hazardous fuels management. I

also appreciate the funding proposed for the Forest Inventory Analysis program. This provides important information to our States, to industry, and other land managers on the health of all of our Nation's forests. It will allow this information to be collected in interior Alaska for the very first time, which the State has advocated for, for many years.

I also appreciate that unlike previous years where the subsistence program line item was proposed for elimination, that funding is included at last year's level. This is critical for managing the subsistence resource in Alaska, so I thank you for that.

There are a few things that I do find concerning, so I have to mention those as well. The budget requests \$127.7 million for Federal land acquisition through the Land and Water Conservation Fund, \$65 million of which is proposed to be mandatory spending. That is a staggering \$80 million above fiscal year 2015. While the President's budget doesn't respect the budget caps, this subcommittee is still bound by the Budget Control Act.

And while I do believe we should reauthorize and modernize the Land and Water Conservation Fund, this is a proposal, looking at your budget, Chief, that I can't support.

The administration is yet again proposing the Integrated Resource Restoration program, which has been rejected multiple times by this subcommittee, because the Forest Service has not yet demonstrated the effectiveness of the current IRR pileup projects. And I know that I bring this up with you at every budget hearing, so it is back before us again.

Despite the problems that I see with the President's request, there are also areas where I do believe we can be working together. For example, I am committed to working with my colleagues to find a way to stop fire borrowing. Fire borrowing undermines the appropriations process and restricts our ability to complete important work on the ground because of the loss of field seasons. Future activities are further impeded when we are forced to repay fire suppression costs in the following fiscal year.

I am hopeful that during the course of this Congress, we will reach agreement on how to end this destructive cycle.

We also need to get back to the idea that the Forest Service should manage our forests for multiple use and sustained yield. While I appreciate the idea of the new Forest Service mantra, which is "Caring for the Land, Serving the People," it doesn't always feel like you are living up to it in Southeast Alaska and the Tongass area, and in other parts around the country.

What would best serve the people of my State is a sustainable timber industry, and no one is suggesting that we should roll back the clock and engage in what some might consider irresponsible forestry management. Alaska has proven that robust development, tourism, and habitat can successfully coexist, and I know that there are many, many examples across the country.

The elementary school where I went as a kid was once robustly funded by a thriving Federal timber program, but today it relies on Secure Rural Schools subsidies, which are harder and harder to find space for in our annual budget. This is a problem of the Forest Service's own creation. So I look forward to hearing how the Forest Service proposes to correct it.

It is not a false choice to pursue both healthy local economies and healthy forests. We can have both. And if we work toward that as our goal, we will solve many of the problems that we currently face.

We wouldn't require hundreds of millions of dollars for subsidies to our logging communities. We could make great strides in reducing fuel loads in our Federal forests. And we could make advancements in technology that will result in commercial uses for currently nonmerchantable timber. Most importantly, we could have thriving and healthy communities and forests.

During questions, I want to discuss several challenges that we are facing and hear your ideas for solutions to them. I would like to hear about the Forest Service plans for air tanker modernization, and aircraft availability this fire season, and then going into the future. I would also like to hear how the Forest Service proposes to increase revenues to counties while phasing out the Secure Rural Schools program. And I would also like to hear about any developments the Forest Service has made toward maintaining a sustainable timber industry in Alaska.

Again, Chief, thank you for being here today. I look forward to your testimony.

And with that, I will turn to my ranking member, Senator Udall.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TOM UDALL

FOREST SERVICE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET REQUEST

Senator UDALL. Thank you very much, Chairman Murkowski.

And good morning and welcome, Chief Tidwell, and Budget Director Tony Dixon. Thank you for joining us today as we discuss the fiscal year 2016 budget request for the Forest Service.

This is very important to New Mexico. We are home to seven national forests and one national grassland. We are also a hotspot for almost every management issue that the Forest Service faces: the economic activities of timber, mining, grazing, and recreation; the protection of wilderness, watersheds, and endangered species; the impact of disease, drought, and fire.

In New Mexico, we are dealing with historic drought and devastating wildfires. The Las Conchas fire in 2011 destroyed over 156,000 acres, half of it in the Santa Fe National Forest. It was New Mexico's largest fire in history, but not for long.

In 2012, the Whitewater-Baldy fires burned up almost twice as much acreage, 298,000 acres in the Gila National Forest.

Then in 2013, the Silver fire, 138,000 acres burned also in the Gila, the third largest fire on record in our State.

I commend the Forest Service for their efforts to fight these fires and to repair the damage. The Burned Area Emergency Repair program was a great help to stabilize the burned-over landscape, clean up cultural and heritage sites, and repair trails. That war continues. Even with these funds, it will take many years.

And the changing climate is making this type of fire more likely. More and more trees are dying across the southwest due to historic drought and increased temperatures. Winter warming has worsened bark beetle outbreaks by allowing more beetles, which normally die in cold weather, to survive and reproduce. Wildfire and

bark beetles killed 20 percent of trees in Arizona and New Mexico forests from 1984 to 2008.

The danger is clear and growing. It is crucial to fund programs that reestablish healthy, resilient forests that can withstand fire and disease.

I totally agree with what the Chairman said in terms of talking about sustainable forestry. I think that is something that the two of us can agree on, and I would like to work with you on that.

We can't keep borrowing, though, on this Forest Service situation, borrowing from Peter to pay Paul. We have to move beyond the cycle we are stuck in. We can't keep fighting fires with money borrowed from programs that help prevent them. The Forest Service needs to be able to pay for firefighting without gouging its other mission areas.

Firefighting now takes 47 percent of its budget, compared to just 13 percent in the early 1990s, and that is clearly, Chief, as you know, not sustainable.

The disaster cap proposal included in the budget is an opportunity to both stop the borrowing and, at the same time, dedicate funding to restore our forests. I look forward to talking about how we can work together to get this proposal signed into law.

I am also looking forward to discussing with you a number of the regular proposals in the budget, including a \$20 million increase for the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program. New Mexico has two ongoing collaborative projects. I would like to talk about how this increase will be used and whether it could help projects in my State.

There are other management issues to consider as well. The budget again proposes the consolidation of major accounts within the National Forest System into the Integrated Resource Restoration line item. This began as a pilot program, as you know, Chief, in fiscal year 2012, in the three Forest Service regions. That includes all of New Mexico's national forests, which are also undergoing management plan revisions under the new 2012 planning rule. So I hope to hear more about that process.

Finally, the budget includes an additional \$8 million for Forest Legacy projects and \$15.5 million for Land Acquisition. New Mexico projects are not included on either list this year, but full support for the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) is as important as ever. LWCF is vital to protecting our public lands, and I look forward to hearing from you, Chief Tidwell, and to discuss these matters with you this morning.

And with that, I yield back, Madam Chair.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Senator Udall.

With that, let's go to the Chief this morning. Welcome to the subcommittee.

And, Mr. Dixon, we appreciate you being here as well.

I would like to get right in to the Chief's comments, so we can move to questions and answers. If members have an opening statement that they would like to submit for the record, we are happy to include that. But let's, at this time, invite the Chief to present on behalf of the Forest Service.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF TOM TIDWELL

Mr. TIDWELL. Madam Chair Murkowski, Ranking Member Udall, Senator Tester, Senator Daines, I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to talk about the fiscal year 2016 budget request for the U.S. Forest Service. Once again, I really appreciate the work we have been able to accomplish over the last year working together to address the needs of our communities, but also primarily to help restore our Nation's forests.

I just want to highlight a few of the key points of our budget request.

The first one is that this budget request will continue to allow us to increase the pace and scale of restoring our Nation's forests and grasslands by doing restoration on 2.9 million acres, restoring over 3,200 miles of streams, restoring 2,000 miles of road, improving the ecological condition on 20 key watersheds, and producing 3.2 billion board feet. This is one of the key outputs that come off our restoration work, and it basically reflects about a 33 percent increase from when I first addressed this subcommittee 5 years ago.

It also is asking for additional money, an additional \$20 million to expand the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program (CFLRP). This program has proven the benefits of making multiyear commitments of funding to large landscapes, and I am anxious we will be sending a 5-year report on the CFLRP accomplishments. We will be sending the report to the Hill next week.

I also want to be able to use the additional money that we are asking for in our Integrated Research Restoration budget line item. We are asking for another \$27 million. Part of that I would like to use to do a pilot approach similar to CFLRP, but in the landscapes in the country that are not dominated by fire-dependent ecosystems.

If you look at the CFLRP map, you see where those 23 projects are spread across the country, there is a couple big parts of our country that do not have any projects there because they do not have these fire-dependent ecosystems. But I would like to be able to take a pilot approach to be able to use a similar concept to be able to make a multiyear commitment of funds to be able to address the forest health issues in those parts of the country and at the same time be able to sustain the integrated wood products industry.

This budget request does maintain the significant increase in hazardous fuels funding that you granted us last year, so that we can continue to treat another 1.7 million acres of hazardous fuels in wildland-urban interface.

It will also allow us to maintain the level of preparedness resources so that we will continue to suppress 98 percent of all wildland fires where we take initial attack, while dealing with now over 58 million acres of wildland-urban interface.

The budget request does ask for a fire cap adjustment to deal with the cost of fire suppression. This is an approach that I really appreciate the support of the members, and their leadership, to be able to find a legislative solution. But it is past time for us to find a fix and to stop the transfer, to stop having to shut down oper-

ations in August, be able to move funds from all the programs across the country, to be able to pay the cost of fire suppression, and then just have Congress appropriate the money to pay it back in the next year or the year after.

So this is, I think, our best opportunity, once and for all, to finally solve this problem.

With the budget fire cap adjustment, our request still includes 70 percent of the 10-year average. The 10-year average went up between fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2016. The 10-year average went up \$115 million this year. I think it is just another example of why we need to find a different approach to address fire suppression cost.

With the fire cap adjustment, we still would be funding the suppression on probably 99 percent of our fires through our appropriated budget. It is just about 1 percent of our fires that result in about 30 percent of the costs. We would like those fires to be considered a natural disaster.

Those are the fires that impact our communities, where we spend the millions of dollars on it. And just like last year, the top 10 fires we had last year, were the most expensive fires, \$329 million. So I think last year was just another example that really supports this legislative solution of being able to recognize that this very small number of fires, this 1 percent of the fires, should be treated as a natural disaster.

This budget request does ask for some increases in the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and our Forest Legacy Program. When I look at the projects that we are proposing to fund with this additional money, it has been my experience that the acquisitions are on relatively small tracks. It has been my personal experience that, in every case, it reduces the administrative costs; it removes boundaries we maintain; it allows us to be able to do restoration treatments across larger landscapes and not have to be worried about dealing with an isolated 640 acres. It also provides certainty for public access, even on some of these parcels that today the public is allowed to cross to be able to access the national forests. Nobody knows for sure if that'll be there in the future, but by acquiring these parcels, it does guarantee public access.

With our Forest Legacy Program, it also allows us to work with willing landowners to put a conservation easement on their land to allow them to keep their land and to keep it working versus having to sell it to some form of development.

This budget request does include the increased request for Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA), and I appreciate, Madam Chair, you mentioning that. This is an essential program, not just for the Forest Service, but every State forestry agency, and industry. The timber industry relies on this information.

It is essential that we be able to maintain, not only the quality of the information, but be able to expand it to include interior Alaska, but at the same time be able to reduce the frequency of how often we read the plots. As we see the changes that are occurring in our landscapes, they are driven by multiple infestations of insect and disease, fire, and climate change. There is a necessity for us to be able to increase the frequency of reading these plots so we

have the information that we need to make sure that we can sustain the Nation's forests.

PREPARED STATEMENT

Then, the last key part of the budget is our proposal to reauthorize Secure Rural Schools. I believe it is just essential that we find a way to reauthorize this program that has proven to be very successful, and to provide that safety net to our communities. At the same time, it has also provided funding for us to do additional restoration work that is strongly supported by our counties and our boroughs across the country.

So thank you for letting me take a few minutes to just highlight a few points of this budget request, and I look forward to answering your questions.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TOM TIDWELL

Madam Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for inviting me to testify on the President's budget request for the Forest Service for fiscal year 2016. I appreciate the support this subcommittee has shown for the Forest Service in the past. I look forward to continuing to work with members of the subcommittee to ensure that stewardship of our Nation's forests and grasslands serve the desires, expectations, and interests of the American people. I am confident that this budget, paired with the passage of a wildland fire suppression budget cap adjustment, will allow the Forest Service to meet the increasingly complex challenges of natural resource management while fostering efficiency and demonstrating cost-effective spending.

BUDGET REQUEST AND FOCUS AREAS

The President's proposed overall budget for discretionary funding for the Forest Service in fiscal year 2016 is \$4.9 billion. That is \$130 million less than the fiscal year 2015 enacted level, but it reflects strategic investments to increase forest restoration and reduce wildfire threats to communities. This budget focuses on five key areas: restoring resilient landscapes, building thriving communities, managing wildland fires, promoting safety, and building diversity and inclusiveness. It proposes a fiscally responsible funding strategy for wildland fire management, contributes to long-term economic growth, and continues our efforts to achieve the greatest benefits for the taxpayer with the most cost-effective approach. This budget will enable us to more effectively reduce fire risk, manage landscapes more holistically, and increase the resiliency of the Nation's forests and grasslands as well as the communities that border them.

RESTORING RESILIENT LANDSCAPES

The Forest Service responds to the many stressors affecting our landscapes and watersheds by working to restore healthy, resilient forests and grasslands. By restoration, we mean re-establishing the functions and processes characteristic of healthier, more threat-resistant, and more resilient ecosystems, even if they are not exactly the same ecosystems that existed before. These efforts reduce carbon emissions and make forests and grasslands more resilient in the face of climate change as well as climate-related disturbances, such as wildfires and insect outbreaks. Our goal is to protect and regain the ability of America's forests and grasslands to deliver all the social, economic, and ecological values and benefits that Americans want and need, both now and for generations to come.

In fiscal year 2012, Congress authorized a pilot program where multiple budget line items were combined into a single line item, Integrated Resource Restoration, in three Forest Service regions. Combining funds from multiple budget line items allows us to better integrate and align watershed protection and restoration into all aspects of our management. Results from the pilot program consistently show that budget planning is simpler and managers have more flexibility to complete restoration work. When programs are better integrated, it is easier to establish goals and set priorities. Given the demonstrated success of this approach in the three pilot regions, we propose to fully implement Integrated Resource Restoration across the en-

tire Forest Service in fiscal year 2016, with a budget of \$822 million. This level of funding and the associated outputs below are dependent on the passage of a fire suppression cap adjustment and will help us implement restoration projects to address insect and disease outbreaks in areas designated under the 2014 Farm Bill and to work with the States under our new Good Neighbor Authority. If funded at the requested budget level, we will use the Integrated Resource Restoration line item to treat 2.9 million acres to improve watershed function and resilience, sell 3.2 billion board feet of timber, maintain over 52 percent of the watersheds across the National Forest System at a properly functioning condition, and improve the condition of up to an additional 20 watersheds.

Created in 2009, the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program encourages collaborative, science-based ecosystem restoration of priority landscapes. The program currently supports 23 large-scale projects for 10-year funding to implement priority restoration projects on National Forest System lands while engaging local communities and leveraging partner resources through collaboration, implementation, and monitoring. The projects support an array of restoration activities, including reducing hazardous fuels, restoring watershed function and resilience, increasing pollinator habitat, and improving forest vegetation and wildlife habitat. These collaborative projects help local economies by creating and maintaining jobs in rural communities, generating commercial timber and biomass for energy production, and restoring forest health while reducing the need for fire suppression in overgrown forests. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget for the Forest Service includes a proposal to eventually increase funding authority for the program from \$40 million to \$80 million, with funding in fiscal year 2016 requested at \$60 million. The funding increase will allow us to pursue up to 10 additional projects. Accordingly, the budget proposes extending authority for the program through 2024 to allow for full completion of new projects.

The fiscal year 2016 President's budget for the Forest Service sets the stage for restorative actions, providing the necessary infrastructure as well as the needed scientific and organizational foundations for ecological restoration. Our researchers will provide managers with the knowledge they need to make sound risk-based decisions to take restorative actions, partly through the Regional Hubs for Risk Adaptation and Mitigation to Climate Change. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget funds Forest Service Research and Development at \$292 million. That includes \$83 million for Forest Inventory and Analysis, an increase of \$13 million from the fiscal year 2015 enacted level. This additional funding will allow us to inventory the vast, remote forests of interior Alaska for the first time using state-of-the-art remote sensing technology combined with field teams to verify our initial results.

It will also allow us to address 5 of the 11 provisions in the Forest Inventory and Analysis strategic plan, developed pursuant to direction in the 2014 Farm Bill. These provisions include improved forest carbon and biomass estimation, enhanced forest ownership study, improvements in land use and land cover research, annualized forest products monitoring, and inventorying the full base target of 15 percent of plots in the East and 10 percent of plots in the West annually.

BUILDING THRIVING COMMUNITIES

The Forest Service works to build thriving communities across the Nation by providing communities with the many economic benefits that result from sustainable multiple-use management of the national forests and grasslands, helping urban communities reconnect with the outdoors, and expanding the benefits that both rural and urban residents get from outdoor recreation. Rural communities rely on the landscapes around them for hunting, fishing, and various amenities.

Forest-dependent rural counties and communities have long benefited from Forest Service payments to support rural schools, including payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000. We propose reauthorizing the act through 2019. This will help timber-dependent rural communities transition to a more diverse, resilient economic model that is less reliant on the receipt of Federal financial support.

Jobs and economic benefits stem from our administration of the National Forest System, including its multiple uses, as well as from investments in the activities, access, and infrastructure needed to deliver essential public services such as clean water, electrical power, and outdoor recreational experiences. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget for the Forest Service will focus on building thriving communities by providing jobs and benefits in two key areas: outdoor recreation and forest products. We will also continue to issue and renew grazing permits, execute timber sales, and permit other commercial uses of forests and grasslands nationwide.

Jobs and Benefits from Outdoor Recreation

Spending by visitors engaging in recreation activities, including skiing, hiking, hunting, and fishing, supports more jobs and economic output than any other activities on the National Forest System. In 2012, outdoor recreation on the National Forest System supported around 190,000 jobs and contributed about \$13 billion to the Nation's gross domestic product.

We offer a range of recreational opportunities across the National Forest System to connect people with nature in an unmatched variety of settings and through a plethora of activities. We will expand programs that demonstrate success and explore new partnerships that will leverage resources to help get more kids outdoors, up close and personal with nature. We will also reconnect visitors with America's outdoor heritage and help them learn about the Great Outdoors, improving their quality of life as they become citizen-stewards of their public lands. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget would fund the Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness program at \$263.9 million. Reauthorization of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act through fiscal year 2017 would help us meet public demand for sustainably managed recreational facilities.

We manage our infrastructure to ensure safety, protect water quality, and conserve wildlife habitat, especially threatened, endangered, and sensitive species. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget includes a \$33 million investment in Deferred Maintenance and Infrastructure Improvement to address the backlog of maintenance and repair of Forest Service facilities.

Jobs and Benefits from Timber, Grazing, and Other Uses

Through work on National Forest System lands, the timber and forest products industries, livestock producers, and minerals/energy production collectively support about 118,000 jobs. Each year, these industries contribute about \$11.5 billion to America's gross domestic product. In rural areas in particular, these uses deliver sustained social and economic benefits to communities.

Our restoration work will create local jobs and help sustain communities, as will the sale of restoration byproducts. We will use traditional timber sales as well as our stewardship contracting authority to restore watersheds and healthy, resilient forested landscapes on National Forest System lands while engaging communities in management of their public lands. Our fiscal year 2016 target for timber volume sold is 3.2 billion board feet, up from 2.9 billion board feet in fiscal year 2015. We will promote woody biomass utilization and biomass markets and facilities, providing jobs and other community benefits. Local communities will also benefit from fuelwood, special forest products, and safe drinking water supplies from the national forests.

However, the national forests account for only 20 percent of the Nation's forested lands. The remainder is under State, private, tribal, municipal, or other Federal ownership. Private forests alone supply almost 30 percent of the Nation's surface drinking water, provide habitat for 60 percent of at-risk species, and furnish more than 90 percent of domestically produced timber. Accordingly, our responsibilities to support sustainable forest management go far beyond the National Forest System lands.

We will continue to support sustainable forest management on a landscape scale through a variety of educational and technical assistance programs for private forest landowners. Rural communities benefit from nearby forests, which provide local jobs, bolster rural economies and community infrastructure, and furnish opportunities for rural Americans to connect with the Great Outdoors. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget proposes maintaining our investment in forest landowner assistance through \$23 million in funding for the Forest Stewardship program.

Land Acquisition and Improved Public Access

We join the U.S. Department of the Interior in requesting \$400 million in discretionary funding and \$500 million in mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund in fiscal year 2016, with all \$900 million coming from mandatory funding in fiscal year 2017. Full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund supports the President's agenda of improving public access. Accordingly, we will work with partners to protect critical forested landscapes from conversion to developed uses through \$61 million in discretionary funding for the Forest Legacy Program, \$8 million more than the fiscal year 2015 enacted level.

Our Land Acquisition Program will provide access for people, protect critical ecosystems, and prevent habitat fragmentation. Land acquisitions provide proven value for the taxpayer, making it easier and less expensive for people to access their public lands—and easier and less expensive for the Forest Service to manage and restore the lands entrusted to our care. An analysis by The Trust for Public Land

showed that every \$1 invested in Federal land acquisition returns \$4 to the taxpayer. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget proposes \$63 million in discretionary funding for our Federal Land Acquisition program, an increase of \$15.5 million from the fiscal year 2015 enacted level. Five million dollars of the discretionary funds will be used to acquire tracts to improve sportsman and recreational access to National Forest System lands.

In and around our cities, we will work with partners to sustain and restore urban forests. This not only helps ensure widespread access to green space, but provides other vital benefits such as energy savings, flood and pollution control, and climate change mitigation. The vast majority of Americans live in urban areas and urban and community forests cover about 130 million acres, an area larger than California. Tree-lined streets and open spaces improve quality of life for millions of Americans and we will work with urban communities to protect and expand these amenities. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget funds Urban and Community Forestry at \$23.7 million.

MANAGING WILDLAND FIRES

Increasingly severe fire seasons are one of the greatest challenges facing the Nation's forests. The Forest Service will continue to collaborate with its Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, partners, and stakeholders on the implementation of the National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy to safely and effectively extinguish fire when needed, use fire where allowable, manage our natural resources and, as a Nation, live with wildland fire.

The Forest Service has one of the most effective fire organizations in the world and continues to keep almost 98 percent of the wildfires we fight very small. However, the few fires that do escape initial response tend to grow much larger far more quickly than ever before. In addition, the cost of fire suppression has soared in the past 20 years.

We are again proposing a revised funding strategy for wildfire suppression. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget proposes discretionary funding for suppression at a level represented by 70 percent of the 10-year average of fire suppression costs. This level of funding provides for suppression of 99 percent of the fires we fight.¹ In addition, up to \$855 million would be made available under a disaster funding cap adjustment to meet funding needs for fire suppression above the base appropriation. This strategy would provide increased certainty in addressing growing needs for fire suppression funding while better protecting non-suppression programs from funding transfers that diminish their effectiveness. Moreover, it would allow us to stabilize our investments in restoring forested landscapes, helping forests adapt to the growing effects of climate change, and preparing communities in the wildland/urban interface for future wildfires.

Restoring Fire-Adapted Ecosystems

Fire plays a beneficial role in maintaining the ecological stability of many landscapes, and the Forest Service is working with partners to restore healthy, resilient, fire-adapted ecosystems. Our goal, especially near homes and communities, is to prepare forests and grasslands to resist stresses such as drought and recover from disturbances, including wildfires. Our large-scale restoration projects are designed in part to restore fire-adapted forest types across large landscapes, including the reintroduction of periodic wildland fire where safe and effective.

Developing new markets for the low-value woody materials we remove during restoration and hazardous fuels treatments will help offset the costs of these activities while providing new revenue streams for private landowners. Therefore, this remains a top priority for the Forest Service. We will continue to provide grants and other forms of assistance for wood-to-energy initiatives, and to help projects compete for other sources of funding. We will also provide technical assistance to help facilities that convert wood to energy become or remain financially viable.

Building Fire-Adapted Human Communities

More than 46 million homes in the United States, or about 40 percent of our Nation's housing units, are located in fire-prone parts of the wildland/urban interface. We will continue providing scientific and analytical support to help these communities become fire-adapted. This work includes completing hazardous fuels treatments, preparing community wildfire protection plans, becoming designated as Firewise Communities through the national Firewise program, and obtaining equipment to respond to and mitigate wildfire. Our goal is to encourage communities to

¹A joint analysis between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior found that 1 percent of fires are responsible for 30 percent of suppression costs.

adapt to wildland fire by establishing an effective emergency response plan and managing risk in a way that protects lives, property, and wildland resources. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget proposes funding the corresponding Research and Development program at nearly \$20 million and the Joint Fire Science Program at nearly \$7 million, both about equal to the fiscal year 2015 enacted levels.

We will control fuels in the wildland/urban interface by removing buildups of dead vegetation and thinning overly dense forests. We will focus on treating high-priority areas, including municipal watersheds to protect water supplies. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget proposes \$359 million for our Hazardous Fuels program, approximately the same as the fiscal year 2015 enacted level.

Responding Appropriately to Wildfire

Where suppression is needed to protect homes and property, we will continue to deploy resources at appropriate places and times. Fire managers are using improved decision support tools to make risk-based assessments about when and where to suppress a fire—and when and where to use fire to achieve management goals for long-term ecosystem health and resilience. Our primary goal is always to protect life and property. Our collaborative interagency emergency response capacity, executed in cooperation with law enforcement, helps us accomplish this by focusing on preparedness for wildfire and other natural disasters and assuring an appropriate risk-based response.

We will continue to maintain an appropriate level of preparedness. Our Preparedness program has proven its worth. Fire Program Analysis, a strategic management tool, shows that every \$1.00 subtracted from preparedness funding adds \$1.70 to suppression costs because of small fires that escape to become large fires. Maintaining an adequate level of preparedness will reduce overall fire management costs. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget proposes \$1.08 billion in Preparedness funding.

We will continue pursuing our Large Airtanker Modernization Strategy. Airtankers play a crucial role in keeping fires small. In fiscal year 2016, the Forest Service expects to have up to 21 airtankers available. Fifteen will be next generation and six will be legacy. One of the 16 will be a Forest Service C-130H. Our strategy is to fund both the older aircraft still in operation (needed as we transition to newer aircraft) and the next-generation airtankers currently under contract.

We will also continue leveraging State and local firefighting resources by providing State and volunteer fire assistance. State and local fire departments are the first responders to almost 75 percent of the Nation's wildfires, so investing in their capacity is a high priority for the Forest Service. Federal grants are matched dollar for dollar, extending the value of our investments. We propose funding the State Fire Assistance Program at \$78 million and the Volunteer Fire Assistance Program at \$13 million, both nearly equal to the fiscal year 2015 enacted levels.

PROMOTING SAFETY

Forest Service work can take us into high-risk environments. Ensuring human safety entails recognizing and managing these risks. For several years now, the Forest Service has been on a learning journey to become a safer organization. Our efforts have resulted in a reduction of work-related annual fatalities from a 5-year running average of 7.4 per year in 2009 to a current rate of 1.8 per year. We have also seen a 28-percent drop in new workers' compensation claims (from nearly 3,700 annual claims to 2,700 annual claims) over the same period. Our goal is to become a zero-fatality organization by continuing to make safety an integral part of our organizational culture.

BUILDING DIVERSITY AND INCLUSIVENESS

At a time when the vast majority of Americans live in metropolitan areas, part of the Forest Service's job is to reach out to urban and underserved communities to give more people opportunities to get outdoors, participate in public land management, and engage in conservation work in their own communities. Building on USDA priorities, we will create and retain a more diverse workforce that reflects American society. Diversity of thought is key to allowing successful organizations to respond to changing circumstances, and it stems from hiring people from varied backgrounds. We will strive to become an employer of choice for all Americans by continuing to treat everyone fairly and respectfully and giving everyone in our workforce the opportunity to contribute and succeed.

We will expand access to the outdoors for underserved and minority communities and young people from urban areas by continuing to invest in programs designed to reach out to urban youth. We will also build on our work with partners to offer

opportunities for youth in urban areas to engage in conservation work in their own communities and on National Forest System lands. We will continue to support the President's America's Great Outdoors initiative, with its target of 10,000 students serving on public lands. Forest Service Job Corps sites established eight Public Lands Corps projects, enabling 1,825 Job Corps students to participate in 21st Century Conservation Service Corps projects.

COST SAVINGS AND AVOIDANCE

The Forest Service is committed to achieving the greatest benefits for the taxpayer at the lowest cost. Mindful of the need for savings, we have taken steps to cut operating costs. Taking advantage of new technologies, the Forest Service has streamlined and centralized our financial, information technology, and human resources operations to gain efficiencies and reduce costs. We will maintain the \$100 million reduction in overhead costs (cost pools) implemented in fiscal year 2013–2014.

In 2012, we adopted a new planning rule designed to reduce the length of time it takes to revise management plans, thereby reducing costs. We are also reducing costs by making our environmental review process under the National Environmental Policy Act more cost-effective.

We have adopted new public-private partnership strategies for leveraging restoration funding. For example, over 10 years the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program is expected to generate \$152 million in partner funding. In 2010, we also signed an agreement to use municipal funds to restore fire-damaged national forest land in the municipal watershed of Denver, Colorado. Over 5 years, Denver Water is matching the Forest Service's own \$16.5 million investment in watershed restoration. We have signed similar agreements with other cities.

FUTURE OUTLOOK

For more than a century, the Forest Service has served the American people by ensuring that their forests and grasslands deliver a full range of values and benefits. Americans benefit tremendously from investments in Forest Service programs and activities.

We are now facing some of the greatest ecological challenges in our history. Invasive species, climate change effects, regional drought and watershed degradation, fuel buildups and severe wildfires, habitat fragmentation and loss of open space, and devastating outbreaks of insects and disease all threaten the ability of America's forests and grasslands to continue delivering the ecosystem services Americans want and need. In response, the Forest Service is increasing the pace and scale of ecological restoration. We are working to create healthy, resilient forest and grassland ecosystems capable of sustaining and delivering clean air and water, habitat for wildlife, opportunities for outdoor recreation, and many other benefits.

Our budget request focuses on our highest priorities: restoring resilient landscapes; building thriving communities; and managing wildland fire safely and effectively, all while continuing to cultivate a highly diverse and inclusive workforce. We will continue to integrate our programs and activities while advancing on our journey toward becoming a safer organization that is more diverse and inclusive. We will also continue to reduce our environmental footprint and improve our administrative operations for greater efficiency and effectiveness.

This concludes my testimony, Madam Chairman. I would be happy to answer any questions that you or the subcommittee members have for me.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Chief. Appreciate the overview, the summary there.

Let's move straight to questions. Again to members, we will do 6-minute rounds here.

BIG THORNE SALE

I want to start off my questions this morning going local, talking about the Tongass. We spend a lot of time talking about the Tongass, and there has been a lot of discussion over the past several years about how the Big Thorne sale is going to be that sale that allows everything to kind of be pieced together.

But you and I both know that not only is the timber sale caught up in litigation, but now even planning and other non-ground-dis-

turbing activities associated with the Big Thorne sale are in jeopardy because of litigation through the Endangered Species Act.

Now you have mentioned that the Forest Service has done significant work on endangered species issues relating to Big Thorne, but give me some reason for optimism this morning about the chances, the likelihood, of this sale going forward this spring as we need it to in order to, again, allow this all to be pieced together.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Madam Chair, you are aware of the preliminary injunction motions that we received on this sale. We have already filed our first brief on the first one, and we will be shortly filing our second brief on the second one. I am going to remain confident that we have done an adequate level of analysis to address the issues, that we have made changes in the decision to address those issues months ago.

So I am going to remain confident that we are going to be able to get a favorable ruling and be able to move forward with the implementation of the Big Thorne sale. It is essential that we provide the bridge timber that is necessary as we transition to second growth. But it is also just another reason for us to be able to look at every opportunity we have while we are moving forward with the bridge timber, bringing the second growth timber supply online at the same time. I still think that is our best solution.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Let me ask you about that because, in this day and age, when we are dealing with litigation based on our timber sales, quite honestly, we don't have a lot of reason to be optimistic, and it is greatly concerning to me. Even if the Big Thorne sale makes it out of litigation, there is really nothing by way of additional volume behind it. We have Saddle Lakes and Wrangell that have been repackaged, reanalyzed, so many times, and yet we haven't seen timber out of either of these sales.

So what we have going on is kind of a repackaging, basically planning the same sale for five different times. That isn't necessarily progress, because we are not seeing wood harvested.

SADDLE LAKES SALE

So a question to you about your prognosis on the Saddle Lakes sale: Do you think that we are going to see that out this year? And if so, what will the volume likely be? And do you anticipate that we are going to get sued over that one as well?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, I will not speculate on what will happen with litigation, but we are moving forward with the Kosciusko sale this year, and we are moving forward with Wrangell and Saddle Lakes, whether they'll be offered this year or the next year. They'll be no later than 2016, as part of our bridge timber.

And we are committed to providing that bridge timber, but at the same time to be moving forward with bringing on some sales with the second growth.

The solution here is also to look at these larger, multiyear contracts, just like we have with Big Thorne, so that there is some certainty. When I look at what it is going to take to move to second growth, we have to provide the certainty of the material, and at the same time provide support for retooling of the infrastructure there.

If we can put that together with our bridge timber program, then I am confident that we can have a successful transition.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, you can probably see my expression. I am not confident at all. You have litigation that continues to be a huge hurdle. You are saying a certainty that is needed here, but yet you have this transition to second growth, where you and I know there is great question as how long it is going to take until that second growth is actually ready and will be able to provide a level of harvest that is going to make a difference in the total scheme of things.

So this transition that we keep talking about is more theoretical, more on paper, than actually being able to translate.

RETOOLING

Question for you, regarding litigation, how much is Forest Service spending in the Tongass responding to litigation? Then before my time is up, you mentioned the retooling efforts. I mentioned to you in the Energy Committee last week or 2 weeks ago about the skepticism that I had on the effectiveness of the transition plan and said I am hoping that the administration is still going to be there when it comes to retooling. We haven't seen any of that. We haven't seen this transition aid that we had talked about. You mentioned at that time that you were going to look into the issues with the Credit Reform Act and potentially reprogramming as it relates to transition assistance. So I would like to know whether you have any additional information on that Credit Reform Act, but also if you can give me the number on what we are spending on litigation with Tongass sales?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, your last question first, Madam Chair, is that we have looked into that, and we will not need to have a reprogramming request. We have the funding available and the authority to be able to now sit down and be able to look at how we can work together, provide the necessary grants, and to be able to move forward with retooling that infrastructure.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Will that happen this year?

Mr. TIDWELL. We are ready to move forward with it this year. We will probably be asking for assistance from your staff to be able to work with the mill owners about how to put a package together to be able to move forward with that.

Then on what we are spending on litigation, I will have to give back to you on that. It is not something we normally track.

Senator MURKOWSKI. It has to be a huge expense for you.

Mr. TIDWELL. It is the same staff that prepare the projects. It is the same staff that puts a lot of the planning together. They then have to be able to pull the information together to put the records together for the court and work with the attorneys.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, if you can get us that information, I think it would be helpful, Chief.

Mr. TIDWELL. We will give you an estimate of what it is costing.

Senator MURKOWSKI. All right, and we want to work with you on these retooling funds.

Senator Udall.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Madam Chair. I am going to let Senator Tester start on our side here with the questions.

Senator TESTER. You are a gentleman and a scholar. Thank you very much.

And thank you, Madam Chair.

I guess the most important question I have for you, Chief Tidwell—it is good to have you here. And you, too, Tony.

How's the ticker?

Mr. TIDWELL. Woke up this morning, Senator, and I feel great. Thank you for asking.

Senator TESTER. Well, it is good to have you here.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Look, I don't need to tell you how important the sawmills are as a partner to the Forest Service. We don't want to drive these folks out of business, and then it all becomes a taxpayer-funded problem as far as forest management. I understand there was about 125-plus million board feet come out of the forests in Montana on about 9,000 acres. Eighty percent from my figures were either post and poles or saw logs, and 20 percent was firewood.

That sounds about correct? Your head is nodding?

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes.

Senator TESTER. Okay, good.

So in terms of sound forest management, are you happy with those numbers?

Mr. TIDWELL. It is not near enough of what we need to be doing to change the conditions on the landscape, to restore the resiliency of those forests, and to reduce the wildland fire threat to our communities.

I have tried to be really clear about the challenge we have in front of us, and the need for us to increase the pace and scale of restoration of our Nation's forests.

Senator TESTER. So if you had a magic wand, what would that number be? Or do you have a number for Montana? Would it be double that, triple that, half again as much?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, I would look at the number of acres.

Senator TESTER. Yes.

Mr. TIDWELL. And I think that is really a key point that we need to be really focused on. We are talking 9,000 acres, and I think there is around 17 million acres of national forest in your State.

Senator TESTER. In Montana, yes.

Mr. TIDWELL. When I look at the need there, we need to be treating a lot more of the 9,000 acres. I can give you a more accurate figure, but it definitely needs to be probably closer to at least four times that each year.

Senator TESTER. Okay. And so what is the challenge that your agency faces? Is it a manpower issue? What is it?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, definitely capacity is an issue. We are running at 35 percent fewer employees than what we had the last time we were approaching 3 billion board feet operations. We haven't been able to implement a lot of efficiencies over the past. We are looking forward to moving forward with the Farm Bill authorities.

Your State has been a leader on that. That is going to also help us.

The other thing is that, and especially in your State, we need to be able to move forward with some larger landscape projects, similar to what we have done in your neighboring States, where we can

look at, not thousands, but tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of acres with one environmental assessment.

FARM BILL

Senator TESTER. Amen. I agree with that.

So let's talk about the farm bill stuff for a second that came out of the 2014 farm bill.

Your forest supervisors, are they fully engaged in that? Do they know the tools that are available?

Mr. TIDWELL. They are. We are continuing to do addition training, and to be able to make sure they understand these new authorities and how to use those. It was there in the northern region where they did actually the first project. It was done last December. I think in your State, there are another five or six scheduled for this year.

WORKFORCE

Senator TESTER. Okay, so I want to ask a little bit about manpower. In Region 1, our region, there are about 15 vacancies. That is about a quarter of your workforce. What are the implications of that from a forest management standpoint, and from a law enforcement standpoint, and a recreational standpoint?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, we have had reductions in our workforce across-the-board and all the programs outside of our fire operations. So it has forced us to really set priorities about what work we can get accomplished, and recognizing there are just less employees than what we have had.

At the same time, we continue to explore finding more ways to be more efficient. This budget request does allow for us to be able to get more forest restoration work done. It would allow us to be able to issue more contracts. It would allow us to actually hire a few more people. So it is moving in the right direction for us to be able to change this curve, this trend that we have been on.

LAND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Senator TESTER. Okay, now I want to talk about the Land Water Conservation Fund for just a second. As you know, Montana has a number of collaborative efforts that are moving on, landscape scale, as you talked about, and forest management. I think LWCF plays a critical role in that success.

Could you speak, and I have only a little over a minute left, but could you speak to what would happen if Congress fails to reauthorize LWCF, on a lot of the projects, whether in Montana or somewhere else? What would happen?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, I think over time it would be more challenging for us to be able to address issues with endangered species, for instance. You would see some lands in your State and other States that would be converted to some type of nonproductive use, just because without the Forest Legacy Program, we would be losing that opportunity for conservation easements. Also, our costs for managing will stay the same because we still have to work around these small, isolated parcels. So you see those costs.

But I think one of the key concerns is that as we see more and more private landowners lock up their land and not allow the public to cross their land to access the national forest—and I can understand the reasons why they do that—that is what we have the potential to lose.

So this program has been very successful, not only to provide certainty on access, but reduce costs. But especially in your State, when I look at the recovery of just the grizzly bear, and the work that we have done to acquire key parcels to provide connectivity between the various populations with grizzlies, without the LWCF program, there is no way we would have been able to acquire those corridors and be in such a successful position. We are now able to increase our active management because we provided for the habitat requirements for the grizzly bear.

Senator TESTER. Okay, well thank you, Chief. I appreciate your answers, and I also, just in closing, would say that I think that the firefighting costs and the fire suppression costs, I support you on the cap adjustment on that. I think it is critically important if you are going to do your job on a lot of things you just talked about.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Senator Tester.

Senator Blunt.

MARK TWAIN NATIONAL FOREST

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Chairman.

Chief, I want to talk to you a little about the Mark Twain National Forest. This is a topic we talked about last year. Last we talked about the Collaborative Forest Landscape Program in the Mark Twain, and I asked you at that hearing whether or not there would be prescribed burns that year. You answered that this coming year, you said you didn't know, that on that project they were going to be focused on doing timber harvest and not prescribed burning.

Let me read that exactly so we know what you said. Your quotes were, "This coming year, I do know"—"I do know"—"that, on that project, they are going to be focused on timber harvest and not prescribed burning." That is the end of your quote last year.

Now your staff then did call shortly after that and said you were mistaken, and so we put in the language last year in the bill, the report language, including the language that the subcommittee recommends that no funds shall be used for prescribed fires under the Missouri Pine-Oak Woodlands portion of the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program (CFLRP) until such time as the controversy over whether it could possibly be successful was being resolved.

There had been at least two burns in early February, so when we contacted the Forest Service on that, they said, well, we are actually conducting those burns under a different program.

I thought the language was pretty clear that until we got this worked out that, we wouldn't be conducting—or we recommended that you not conduct those burns. You just feel like the language just doesn't give any direction? Or that you are not bound by what the subcommittee would like to see happen here?

Mr. TIDWELL. Senator, we want to work with the subcommittee and, of course, follow the direction you provide. But on the Mark Twain last year, they sold 54 million board feet of timber and harvested 48 million. When I look at that level of activity, and then with the prescribed burning that we need to do to be able to maintain and restore those forests, we need to do that together.

We want to use our timber sales to be able to remove the merchantable material and make full use of that, but then at the same time, prescribed burning is one of the tools that we use to reduce the residual material that is left after a timber sale. So we need to be able to maintain the use of both tools.

Now I know that in the past, there was a prescribed burn that did burn up some merchantable timber. I understand that happens from time to time. But often, we can just come back in there and salvage that material.

So we really do need to be able to maintain the flexibility to do both. But we are always going to focus on using a timber sale or a stewardship contract to remove the merchantable material and then use prescribed burning to be able to remove the undergrowth.

PREScribed BURNING AND SAVANNAH RESTORATION

Senator BLUNT. So your testimony today would be that the prescribed burn is for that purpose, and no longer for the purpose of trying to restore the Savannah from some past time until we know whether that is possible. That really was the discussion we had last year about whether or not we have really had the science to know if under today's conditions you could ever restore the Savannah from a couple of hundred years ago, even if you burned everything down and started all over again.

What are you burning for now?

Mr. TIDWELL. Depending on which project—

Senator BLUNT. In the Mark Twain, are the burns to try to restore the Savannah, or are the burns to truly get under the fueling levels?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, it would be depending on which project. If we are following a timber sale, we would often use a prescribed burn to follow that. If we are trying to restore the Savannah, to be able to use fire, to be able to do that in conjunction with mechanical treatment, it is the work that needs to be done to restore these ecosystems.

Senator BLUNT. Is there a study going on to determine whether the Savannah could be restored or not?

Mr. TIDWELL. I am not aware. I will have to get back to you on that.

TIMBER SALES AND MONITORING RESULTS

Senator BLUNT. All right, let's get back on that.

On the timber sales, while there is still a lot of timber left, and you and I know that.

I will say, back to your earlier comment, the Missouri forest products industry believes that you have worked hard to try to identify in the last year harvestable and marketable timber. So that is a positive. I have not got a lot of positive things to say about this today, but that is a positive, and I do appreciate that.

But, Chief, we just keep having such a hard time getting information. Last year, I met with the regional forester, Kathleen Atkinson, and asked for proof that this program could work. The response was, we will get back to you on that. And, of course, we never—not “of course,” but we didn’t get any information. Actually, amazingly, we didn’t get any information when we got back on that.

I brought this up to you last year. You stated that you would share the monitoring information from the project and research that guides the type of projects we are putting on the ground. I don’t think we got that information either.

I don’t want to spend our time and effort here doing things that can’t work. In theory, in some of these burns, you are trying to restore a landscape from a couple hundred years ago. Surely, it is worth a little time to see the science of whether that is even possible or not. I am just asking to work harder with us to be responsive.

These questions are not designed to create a problem for you. They are designed to try to help you and I together solve a problem and see if we are moving toward a point that is achievable. I don’t think that is too much to ask.

I am just asking again today, Chief, to work with us on that and be more responsive to both the science that may be out there and the questions that we ask. I hope you can do that.

Mr. TIDWELL. Senator, I will personally look into this and provide you with the information we have from the monitoring and the science that supports the work that they are trying to get accomplished out there on the savannah.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Chairman.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Senator Blunt.

Senator Udall.

FIRE DISASTER CAP ADJUSTMENT

Senator UDALL. Thank you.

Chief, I wanted to focus in a little bit on the budget framework for fire suppression funding with the new disaster cap adjustment. As you know, this subcommittee worked very hard last year to pass this legislation as part of the 2015 Omnibus appropriations bill. Ultimately, we weren’t successful, but we can’t give up.

The disaster cap is the key to breaking the cycle of fire borrowing and putting an end once and for all for the need to steal funds from land management programs to pay for emergency firefighting needs. Many of the programs that we borrow funding from to fight fires are the same programs that create a more resilient landscape to resist wildfire.

Can you talk about how important this proposal is to the administration’s overall vision for reducing the threats of wildfires?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, it is essential. As we look at what has happened just over the last 13, 14 years, the percent of our budget has gone from around 14 percent to over 40 percent. If you add hazardous fuels funding into that, it gets to over 50 percent of our budget that is now focused on dealing with wildland fire.

Under a constrained budget, and as much as I would like to tell you that the cost of suppression is going to go down in the future,

the 10-year average is going to continue to go up. I think there are 2 years in the 10-year average that are less than \$1 billion. When those fall off the average, you are going to see the 10-year average jump up.

It is just essential that we find a way to recognize that we need to provide the funding for fire suppression the year that it is occurring. We are going to take whatever actions necessary to suppress fires where we need to suppress fires. As impactful as it is for us to have to stop operations and transfer funds, we have no choice, but we are going to do that.

So we are going to pay for the cost of fire suppression one way or another. So the idea that we could just have a mechanism so that we could pay for it during the current year instead of shutting down operations and transferring money, and then asking for Congress to repay those funds the next year, or the year after—and I appreciate Congress' willingness to pay back those funds over the years, but we cannot ever replace the time that we have lost.

Often August and September, those are critical field months. When we shut down operations, we never get that time back. Often a project, even if it is just postponed, we often lose the window to be able to implement it. Conditions change on the landscape. So these are the impacts of this transfer that are very hard for us to quantify.

Last year, we put out reports for every State that showed the impacts to each State from having to transfer money. But it did not begin to capture the impacts of just losing that time, and that field season that we lost. So it is essential for this program that we find a way to get this legislation passed and that we no longer have to transfer money each year, and recognize that a very small percentage, 1 percent of these fires, should be treated as a natural disaster, not unlike other natural disasters that we treat and fund accordingly.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Chief. The one thing here that I think is important, we have the budget process coming up. I think it is very important, I hope you pass the message back to Secretary Vilsack and Secretary Jewell, that they work with the new budget chairs for the House and the Senate. I think if we can get it in there, we will have a much better chance to proceed.

VALLES CALDERA NATIONAL PRESERVE

In just the little bit of time I have left, we talked yesterday—and thank you for coming into the office—about the Valles Caldera National Preserve. Could you tell us how you have resolved the funding issues there, and what you are working on, and what you see the plans are for that?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, we are working closely with the National Park Service. The lands were transferred last December, and the funding that was provided for the Valles Caldera, we have that ready to be transferred to the Park Service as soon as they have their budget structure set up to handle that.

In addition, with the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program (CFLRP) that encompassed part of the Valles Caldera along with the adjoining national forest, we were not able to transfer the CFLRP funds to the Park Service, but we are transferring

other appropriated funds to the Park Service to be able to continue that work that was planned for this year, and to continue to work with the trust that is in the process of implementing the work.

So we have that money set aside, ready to be transferred to the National Park Service. So as far as all the work that was planned to occur this year in the Valles Caldera, that should all go forward as planned.

Senator UDALL. Great, thank you very much. We really appreciate the Forest Service and the National Park Service working together to make sure that there is a seamless transition there. Thank you.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Senator Daines.

Senator DAINES. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Got a lot of Montanans here this morning.

TIMBER SALES

Senator DAINES. That is right. Montanans on that side. Montanans on this side.

Good to have you here this morning, Chief Tidwell.

It was a month ago I was back home in Montana, travelled across the State. And we spent a lot of time talking about what is going on in our national forests and in timber. I was in Columbia Falls. I was in Missoula. I was in Bozeman. We were meeting with sawmill operators, sportsman groups, conservation groups, county commissioners.

In fact, they have sawmill operators there who are looking at lay-offs that happened last fall because of, frankly, stopped timber sales, and fears as spring breakup is coming up earlier in the West because of the warm February and the warm early start to March.

To hear a sawmill operator concerned, he has his son who has some special medical needs, and to possibly lose their health insurance, have to go to Spokane every week just for this, just to hear these stories of the human condition right now as we face declining access here to timber. Yet, here we are surrounded by 17 million acres in Montana of forest, 11 million acres where they probably have access to if you subtract out the wilderness and the roadless areas, and we can't get enough logs.

I ask, what is the constraint? Why are the sawmills running at two-thirds capacity across the State? Because we can't get enough logs, as we are staring at 11 million acres of timber that we could access on our Federal lands.

The Forest Service anticipates selling 3.2 billion board feet of timber in fiscal year 2016. It is a modest increase over this year's target. That is a step in the right direction, but my understanding the ASQ, the allowable sale quantity, in the plans by the Forest Service exceeds 6 billion board feet, twice as much as what is being sold today.

We heard from groups across Montana a month ago, whether from the sawmills to the conservation groups, that increasing responsible harvest can have positive environmental and social impacts, reducing the risk of wildfire. It is not going to be the catch-all, but it is part of management and risk reduction, improving wildlife habitat, improving watersheds, improving water quality, maximizing carbon sequestration in our forests, and expanding rec-

reational opportunities. So we have got agreement on the spectrum back home.

And I know, Mr. Tidwell, your volume targets are informed in large part by your resources and the time it takes to prepare and execute timber sales, as you have noted today. But setting aside those factors for a moment, do you agree that in principle that increasing responsible harvest, consistent with the forest plans, would have positive impacts on creating and sustaining forest-related jobs, as well as improving the health of the forest?

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes. I mean, you mentioned the level of agreement that we have on what work needs to occur to restore these national forests. It is greater today than it has ever been in my entire career. We are seeing some progress being made in other parts of the country more than what we are seeing there in Montana, even though I appreciate the work that our folks did last year working with all of our partners—they basically put under contract the most acres and the most board feet that we have had in a long time.

We are moving in the right direction, but it is not enough of what is needed to really restore these forests. We need to be able to look at these larger landscapes and to have more multiyear contracts in place, so that those mill owners can make the investments. They can take those contracts to the bank to borrow the money.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

Senator DAINES. It is shocking talking to the mill operators. When I asked where are you getting your logs today? And literally today—here we are surrounded by millions of acres of Federal lands in Montana—they are bringing logs in from Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, and Canada, to try to keep the mills operating. One of the challenges we are facing back home, and, certainly, we are talking about this all time, is looking what is going on with these objections and the litigation.

Looking at the Region 1 staff data that was provided to us, since the beginning of fiscal year 2009, 46 of the 65 noncategorical exclusion National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) projects with a timber component were appealed, or more recently objected to. Twenty-five of the 65 were litigated.

The problem we have now with our timber folks back home is they are giving up because of the uncertainty of pursuing the path down—some say, why aren't they making more applications? Well, there is so much uncertainty now on the outcomes because of the objections and litigation and appeals and so forth, they are going out of State and even to Canada to get logs today. Even a number of the collaborative-driven projects have been litigated or have litigation pending—the collaboratives. Colt Summit was one of those, and the East Reservoir project on the Kootenay.

In your recent testimony for the Energy and Resources Committee, you indicated that such obstruction has an adverse impact and clearly can divert Forest Service staff from clearing new timber sales. So focusing now on looking at solutions and working together on this, because I think we both agree we have a problem, I think requiring all projects to go through a pre-decision objections proc-

ess was a good step, but events on the ground in Montana suggest it is not sufficient. It is not enough.

What additional solutions do you support to further discourage unnecessary obstruction and litigation in Montana and other impacted States, so the Forest Service can be liberated to do its important work?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, I think there are a couple things. We need to first maintain what is proving to be successful, and as you have mentioned, the collaborative efforts there in your State are making a difference.

We have gone to court, and I will use Colt Summit as a perfect example. When we have gone to court there, we not only have the State and the county, but we have environmental groups that are standing with the Forest Service, arguing to the judge that this is a good project, this is a good timber sale.

Senator DAINES. Just back on that, we agree on the collaboratives. I support that. But even our collaboratives are being litigated, so I think we need additional protections. I guess what I would ask is—I am running out of time here—would you commit to working with me to develop some mutually acceptable solutions here to work through this?

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes. I am more than willing to sit down with this subcommittee and with you personally to be able to look at what we can do as we move forward to be able to build on the success, to be able to get the treatment on the land that is necessary to restore these forests.

I do believe the more that we can be talking about what is needed on the land, what we need to be able to do to restore these forests—and yes, one of the key outputs is going to be timber. It is going to be saw logs. It is essential that we maintain that integrated wood products industry. Otherwise, there is no way we are going to be able to do the work.

Senator DAINES. Well, we were at 600 million board feet at the peak. We were at 100 million board feet last year. We have been pretty flat. And so what we are asking for here is—we understand we are never going to get the 600 million again, most likely. It has been an over 80 percent decline. We have lost 20 of our 30 sawmills—lost.

But what we would like to see is let's take that 100 million up to maybe 200 million, maybe 300 million board feet, off of our Federal lands. That would be a tremendous boost right now to our sawmills and to our timber industry back home, as well as making our forests healthier.

SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS

And our counties right now are dealing with Secure Rural Schools (SRS) and so forth. They are in trouble because there is no more revenues coming off the forests.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, once again, I commit to work with you. I think your approach on that will be able to get it up to a sustainable level that not only the industry can rely on, but it will actually be enough acres being treated where we can make a difference, so that 10 years from now, we can have a different discus-

sion about the conditions of the forest in your State versus having the same discussion 10 years from now.

Senator DAINES. I look forward to that discussion, too. Thank you, Chief Tidwell.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Senator Daines.

Boy, you know, this conversation is just the same whether you are up north in Alaska or whether you are sitting there in Montana. It just is not improving.

TIMBER HARVEST

You are talking about what is going on in your region. Last year, we noted in appropriations language that over the last 10 years, the timber supply in Region 10 up in Alaska has been constrained to less than 10 percent of the allowable sale quantity in the land management plan. We have seen handfuls of our small mills closed down.

It just has not gotten any better. Whether it is in the Tongass, or clearly the comments we have heard from both you and Senator Tester here this morning, we talk about certainty and the need for longer term contracts.

We are so with you there, Chief, so with you. In fact, we agreed so much that we included in the report language from fiscal year 2015 a directive to you, and said that in order to restore confidence in this supply, and allow for investment in new facilities, we reminded you of the Forest Service pledge to prepare and offer the 4-year timber sales.

So we provided specific language. We directed the Forest Service to prepare and offer within 2 years the four 10-year timber sales as promised. So even when we provide that directive to give us that longer term contract, to give us that confidence, nothing on the ground changes.

I don't disagree that you have got a hard job here managing things, but I don't know what to tell the folks in the Tongass anymore, the guys that are trying to hold on to some family-owned operations. And the only reason that they are still in existence is because they and their families, this is what they know. This is who they are. But they are no longer living in a timber community. They are living in a community that is trying to exist off subsidies that we throw them with Secure Rural Schools. It is sad.

We can blame litigation. That is, certainly, a factor. But I think we also have to recognize that the commitments that we are receiving from the Forest Service are not translating into increased harvest on our forests.

So I am discouraged. I am just discouraged, because I don't know where the communities that I was born in like Ketchikan, or raised in like Wrangell, I don't know where they go.

RECREATION, HERITAGE, AND WILDERNESS

I want to talk about the other aspects of industry within the regional economy, because there is more than timber, we know that. There is fishing. There is tourism.

Tourism is, of course, based on the recreational opportunities out there, and yet in the last 5 years, the recreation heritage and wilderness budget has dropped approximately 14 percent across your

budget. Alaska's recreation budget has been hit extra hard, over 23 percent over that same 5-year period.

Tell me why the recreation programs in Alaska is disproportionately affected by past budget cuts compared to other regions, and what can the Alaska region expect from this 2016 budget increase? Is it going to have any impact on the issuance of operating permits?

I am trying to figure out whether there is any good news here for the people in the Tongass, and I am searching hard.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Madam Chair, with recreation, it actually supports more jobs than any other activity we have in the national forests now. Over 200,000 jobs are supported through recreation.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, that is clear in Alaska because we have run off the timber jobs.

Mr. TIDWELL. And in the past, in Region 10, the Alaska region, they have taken a greater, not proportionate, share of reductions in recreation funding. We have had to make some very difficult choices over the years as we have seen our budgets under constraint. Our programs under constrained budget can be very limiting to what we are able to do.

I do know that in fiscal year 2015, we did make a shift for recreation funding in Alaska. They received an increase in what they had been receiving in the past to address this inconsistency. So as we move forward, we are going to look at how to better balance all these programs together.

This budget request does maintain the level of recreation funding. I wish it was more. But until we can fix this fire issue, it takes up so much of our constraint that we are going to continue to see these impacts. You will see slight increases there in your State with recreational funding, but this is something that needs to be addressed across-the-board.

We just have to find some ways to fix the fire suppression issue, so that we can have more flexibility within our budget requests to be able to address these issues.

ROADLESS RULE

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, Chief, I carry with me in the file that I haul everywhere a few maps, because I am big into maps. And if your policies are going to shut off our timber opportunities in the Tongass, and you say, well, move to recreation, move to tourism, and you disproportionately reduce those dollars that go to Alaska, and then you tell us that part of the plan is we have to move towards more renewable resources. We absolutely agree there. But yet, we don't have the ability to get around the roadless rule in Alaska.

It just kind of suffocates you after a while, and you have seen my big map, the roadless area inventory. For colleagues, this is the whole southeastern part of the State of Alaska. This is also the Tongass, because Southeast is the Tongass. Everything in red is categorized as roadless under the roadless rule and is not available for renewable hydroelectric power or other development.

So timber reduction and recreation, not even available for accessing renewable hydroelectric power or other development that will allow us to reduce our energy costs.

These are tough hearings for me, Chief. They are tough because the people of my State bear the consequences.

So my time has expired. I am going to turn to my colleague.

Senator Udall will let Senator Leahy take a breath, or if he's ready to go, we will turn to him. I am done here. We will defer here.

Senator UDALL. Senator Leahy, we are ready for you to go if you want, or I will go ahead.

Senator LEAHY. Why don't you go ahead?

SOUTHWEST ECOLOGICAL RESTORATION INSTITUTE

Senator UDALL. Okay, thank you very much.

Chief, the Southwest Ecological Restoration Institute, which is a collaboration between New Mexico Highlands University, Northern Arizona University, and Colorado State University, and the Forest Service, is a terrific source of applied research and ideas for improving forest health, preventing wildfires, protecting watersheds, creating jobs connected to national forests.

With increasing effects from climate change, like prolonged droughts and less snowpack in our national forests, there are additional strains on the critical water resources in New Mexico. The institute I think does great work in engaging and educating people in New Mexico on forest and watershed management, and I can't see a better time for them to be doing this kind of work.

Despite the benefits of the Forest Service, the funding for the institute has kind of stagnated in the last few years at \$1.5 million, even though they have submitted appropriate and timely projects. Do you feel this level of funding is adequate for the good work the Southwest Ecological Restoration Institutes do? And is the funding for the three individual institutes based on their annual submissions of projects, or is it just based on historic levels of an archaic formula?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, just like with so many of our programs, we have had to make some very difficult choices about setting priorities with our constrained budget. Where I wish we could provide additional funding for the institute, I do feel that the funding we are providing allows them to build and continue their programs.

They have been very helpful in the past, especially when they first started to pull the information together about the different treatments we need to do with ponderosa pine in different parts of the southwest. Your questions about water, drought, that needs to be addressed are another good reason for this institute to continue.

We leave it up to the institute to decide the funding between the different facilities, but I feel that this is a good balance for where we are at right now. In the future, if we once again can get into a different budget situation, no longer having to put so much of our budget into fire, this would also provide us an opportunity to expand these programs.

Senator UDALL. That is why I led with the fire cap situation, because I think we need to work with you on that, so the other good programs that are going on in the Forest Service budget, that they are able to be funded.

COLLABORATIVE FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION PROGRAM

Shifting now to the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program, New Mexico is home to two of the 23 current Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration projects. By all reports, these projects are succeeding in improving habitat and watershed quality, creating employment for youth and adults from nearby Pueblos, Native American Pueblos, and increasing timber production.

The President's budget calls for an increase of \$20 million for the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration program from \$40 million to \$60 million. What are your plans for the additional funding requested? Will you start new projects or provide higher levels of funding to existing projects?

Mr. TIDWELL. Senator, it will be both. With the success we are having with the 23 projects, there is a need to provide some additional funding to those 23. But at the same time, we also want to expand and be able to look at adding additional projects online, recognizing that all of these projects, it takes a few years for them to become fully effective. That is what we are seeing with the projects that we have had online now, some of them for 5 years, some for 3 years.

The report we will be sharing next week, will show the accomplishments that we are making. These exceeded, when it comes to acres of restoring our forest vegetation. The key output of timber has exceeded. Areas about dealing with road conditions is an area we need to expand work in, and also in noxious weeds, another target area.

When we have talked to all of these 23, they all feel very confident they are going to meet their 10-year goals, so we want to use this report, we will be sending up, as another reason why we should expand this program. It is really making a difference.

The other key thing is that many of these projects, without this program—and this comes from the members of the collaboratives—they'll tell you that without this, there is no way we would have been able to look at doing projects on 10,000 to 20,000 acre areas without extensive appeals and objections or lawsuits. That is the other benefit of this program. The way it is designed, the collaborative requirements that have gone a long way to reducing the conflicts and controversy, and allows us to be able to do these projects on much larger scales, and that is an additional benefit.

Senator UDALL. And you really hit it on the head. I think the two projects in New Mexico, the Southwest Jemez Mountains project and Zuni Mountains project near Gallup, New Mexico, they have worked collaboratively. Where you may have had a situation where there was litigation or it was slowed down, because of this collaborative work, they have been able to move forward. So we appreciate all the good work there.

Senator DAINES, did you have another round?

Senator DAINES. I do, and then I will be finished.

Senator UDALL. Okay, that is fine. I am finished.

TIMBER HARVEST TARGET IN MONTANA

Senator DAINES. All right, appreciate it.

So I want to go back. Senator Tester brought up a point of discussion. You indicated that, ideally, harvests in Montana national forests could be at four times in terms of acreage. I think it was that 9,000-acre question, that we could increase by four times the number of acres versus what is currently being done. And just looking at the numbers, I know in Montana last year, about 113 million board feet is what was harvested. Our allowable sale quantity (ASQ) for Montana Federal lands is 371 million board feet, and I think our sustainable long-term yield is 440 million.

There is an old saying, "If you aim at nothing, you will hit it," so I just want to get to the numbers here for a moment.

Of that 113 million board feet that was harvested last year, a significant part of that, about a third, was firewood. As we are looking at moving forward trying to increase these numbers, do you think given the acreage, the four times the number that was discussed, do you think it would be reasonable to suggest we might be able to at least double our volumes, given that we are a quarter of our long-term sustainable yield, we are a third of our ASQs. I mean, seems like doubling would not be unreasonable?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, I think last year, the region met its target, self-imposed target, close to 300 million board feet. That shows you an example of the work that needs to be done, and be able to sustain that and actually build on that.

I go back to my time when I was in the region, and when we looked at the conditions of the forests and what really was needed—the level of treatment, the number of acres that needed to be restored—that 300 million board feet, it is just one of the key outputs. But it does reflect on the number of acres that need to be treated.

Your other point that you made about the biomass that is being removed, it is a combination of saw logs, posts and poles, and firewood. I think the more that people understand what we are about, what we are trying to accomplish on the landscape, I think that can go a long way to address some of the conflict we still see in Montana.

There are perceptions out there that folks believe that when we are proposing restoration work that includes a timber sale, that it is a clear cut from ridge top to streamside. Then they base a lot of their opposition on that level of concern versus the reality that we are restoring these forests, thinning out these forests.

Senator DAINES. They are healthier forests. It is environmentally the best thing we can do right now. It's responsible timber practices.

I guess coming back to the point, do you think, just looking at the raw metrics here, that if we are at 113 million board feet, and we were once at time at 600 million, and we have got ASQs at 371, long-term has a 440, I mean, thinking of getting something between 200 million and 300 million board feet seems like a reasonable target to shoot for.

Mr. TIDWELL. The 300 million board feet is very reasonable.

OUTFITTERS AND GUIDES: MINIMUM WAGE EXEMPTION

Senator DAINES. Okay, thank you.

I want to shift gears for a moment to an issue our outfitters are having back home. Outfitters and guides in Montana, they are the ultimate small-business owners in Montana. Usually, it is a husband and wife running the operation. They don't have a big human resources department. They don't have a legal department. It is usually a couple folks trying to make ends meet.

They have expressed concerns to me about the Forest Service application, the Department of Labor final rule enforcing the new minimum wage regulations for Federal contractors.

I really think the States could take the lead in this issue. The State of Montana recognizes this industry of outfitting is unique. It is a unique industry in Montana. It serves an important purpose, to protect our outdoor heritage and, certainly, the unmatched landscapes we have.

In fact, Montana has carved out in exemption for outfitters and guides in its overtime pay requirements because of the nature of the business.

Chief Tidwell, considering the severe economic impact on these small businesses in looking at this \$10.10 mandate coming out of Federal Government, and the value that outfitters and guides provide to public lands, would the Forest Service consider a similar exemption to overtime requirements like we did in the State of Montana?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, Senator, we are currently looking at the Department of Labor's rule to really understand the flexibility that is provided within that rule, especially when it comes to outfitters and guides. I fully recognize the problems, and the issues.

I want to first take the time that we need to fully understand the flexibility that is within the Department of Labor rule, so that we can move forward with this in a way that also will work for the outfitters and guides.

Senator DAINES. And they have been a great partner. I know they have worked together on performing trail maintenance, wildlife monitoring. It is kind of the boots on the ground out there, in terms of what is going on in our national forests and the wilderness. I just would ask if you would take into account the impacts on the outfitting industry in this proposed rule coming from the Federal Government and will work with our State folks back home. We have solved that problem in the State of Montana by carving out an exemption with the uniqueness of the outfitters and overtime.

This is not just punching the clock in that kind of business. I would just ask if you would help us on this. They are very, very concerned as they are looking at their permits going forward and how they make ends meet with these mandates coming out of Washington.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, I share your concerns, understand their concerns, about how to move forward with this in a way that is fair, and also, at the same time, that it is workable for them. The last thing we want to do is to put anyone out of business. That eliminates the jobs.

Senator DAINES. It does, and they have these great stories where they are taking some of these kids where they maybe have challenging pasts. They bring them out for a summer. They spend a

summer in the wilderness, out there with an outfitter, and they are life-changing experiences for these kids. There are concerns that they can't provide those opportunities with these mandates on these wage issues coming out of Washington. They just don't make any sense for us on the ground back home.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, we are anxious to fully understand the flexibility that is provided in the rule, so that we can look at it. We are in somewhat of a unique situation. When it comes to a contract to do roadwork or something like that, the proposals can factor the additional wages into their bids, so it is equitable, it is easy. With our outfitter and guide permits, especially since they don't all expire at the same time either, so that is the other challenge.

Senator DAINES. That is the exemption, the carve-out that we are looking for that would be helpful.

Thank you. I am out of time.

Senator UDALL. The Senator's time has expired. Thank you, Senator Daines.

Senator Leahy.

FOREST LEGACY PROGRAM

Senator LEAHY. Thank you very much.

Chief, good to see you. Mr. Dixon, good to see you.

We have a lot of people, as you know, who when they talk about the U.S. Forest Service, think first and foremost of the National Forest System. Of course, those of us who live in the Northeast and those in the South know you do a lot of work beyond the national forest boundaries.

You have a lot of support of private forest landowners. Owning a tree farm in Vermont, which we do without any subsidies, I will quickly add, I am well aware of what you do. And I am concerned we are losing private forestland at a very alarming rate, some to subdivisions, but usually conversion to nonforest uses.

So I was pleased to see the strong funding request for the Forest Legacy program. This is near and dear to my heart since I included the program, back in the 1990 Farm Bill when I was chairman, but it has conserved close to 2.5 million acres of working forest. I mean, you know all these numbers. I just want to put it on the record.

Fiscal year 2016, States submitted a list of eligible Forest Legacy projects that require \$147 million in Federal funding and probably leverage another \$90 million in private funds. But last year, we were able to fund this program at only \$53 million.

If we were able to increase the funding for Forest Legacy, do you believe that there is sufficient supply of top-quality projects across the country?

Mr. TIDWELL. Senator, there is no question. We have always had more requests with very high-quality projects than we are able to fund. These are projects that come from the States. Each State puts together their list and then they send it in. We have a national committee go through the projects and set the priorities. So these are strongly supported by the States, local communities, and they are all willing landowners. We have never, ever been able to come close to funding all the projects that we would like to.

Senator LEAHY. These are projects that you have looked at and said, look, they are valid projects, if we had the money, we would do it?

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes, there is no question about the validity and the benefits, not only to the landowner, but the benefits to the public with these projects.

WHITE-NOSE SYNDROME

Senator LEAHY. The other area I have been talking for years about is white-nose syndrome in bats. I remember when I first raised it, people thought I was referring to a character I heard about in a comic book named Batman. But as you know and I know, it is wreaking havoc across the country.

We have a lot of farms and huge farms that suddenly are going to have to switch to use far more pesticides to control the pests that bats used to naturally keep in check. I think it is in around 25 States, and is now one of the most destructive wildlife diseases. We are watching very closely in Vermont as the Fish and Wildlife Service considers what we do.

Some are concerned that the endangered species protection of the Northern long-eared bat, it may actually be counterproductive. It may negatively impact our forestland management, but not do anything on white-nose syndrome.

Are there resources the Forest Service can provide to help the private landowners to address dwindling bat populations, but also to encourage them in conservation practices? I realize that is a kind of a generalized question, but I hear it in various forms back home.

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, first, Senator, thank you for your early recognition of this problem. I can remember when we first started closing access to caves, there was a lot of opposition to that and folks questioned the Forest Service. Fortunately, we were able to take some steps to slow down the spread.

We are continuing our research to look at ways to be able to use native soil bacteria to maybe slow down the fungus, and using some ultraviolet light treatments to be able to reduce the effectiveness of the fungus. But, it is going to take a while for our bat populations to recover from the white-nose syndrome.

At the same time, we have concerns about the potential listing of especially the long-eared bat, and if it could have any impacts on our ability to restore the Nation's forests. So we are working very closely with the Fish and Wildlife Service so that they have the science that we have about white-nose syndrome. Also, they'll fully understand our practices when it comes to maintaining and restoring the Nation's forests. And I look at having healthy, resilient forests as also good for the bats.

Senator LEAHY. Your stewardship contracting authority, can that help?

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes, both our stewardship contracting authority can help, and also our Forest Stewardship program that we have that provides assistance to private landowners, so they can put in place the forestry practices that they need to be able to restore the forests and maintain sustainable forests on their private land.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Senator Leahy.

I am getting a little more familiar with that bat of yours. I do understand it eats the mosquitoes, and that is a good thing.

Senator LEAHY. Yes, I think we need really big ones to go after the mosquitoes in Alaska. I have heard you talk about getting the baseball bat and going after them. But I have actually seen a difference at our own tree farm in Vermont. When we sit out there in the evening, we could always count on several bats from a small bat cave about a quarter of a mile behind our house. Bats would come out and there would be no mosquitoes. Those bats have disappeared. The mosquitoes are now back.

I don't mean that as a scientific analysis, but I can just imagine what it must be like if you have hundreds of acres of farmland, and you count on the bats to keep the pests down. This is a problem.

TSUNAMI DEBRIS

Senator MURKOWSKI. I appreciate you bringing it up.

Chief, I have just a couple more Alaska-specific, and then my final question will be as it relates to the air tankers. This first one is just more of a heads-up.

I met with the head of NOAA, Dr. Sullivan, and mentioned to her when we are talking about tsunami debris clean up along Alaska's coastal shores, we have great efforts, collaborative efforts, to address the tsunami debris. But, as you know, so much of the land along our coast, whether it is in the Tongass or up into the Prince William Sound area and the Chugach, these are our national forest areas, once the debris is collected, you have got to cache it somewhere until it can be airlifted out or barged out.

It was brought to my attention that they had had great cooperation working with the folks at the Chugach, in terms of dealing with Forest Service lands and being able to talk cooperatively, but not so much on the Tongass. Now, we are trying to chase it down, but what I was told was that basically the Forest Service in the Tongass had said don't bring the junk up above the tidelands, we don't want that to be our problem.

We are chasing that down, because I understand there have been good cooperative efforts in marine debris cleanup in the lower part of southeast, but I am just giving you a heads-up on that. I don't ask you to address it today, but just to be aware of it.

SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT, TRANSPORTATION EQUALITY ACT (SAFETEA)

One thing that did come to our attention just yesterday was a letter that the Governor sent our delegation. It was pretty distressing. It said that the Government, your agency, is refusing to follow a 2005 agreement with the State after Alaska has fulfilled its side of the agreement years ago. This is relating to Federal highway funding back in 2005 under SAFETEA-LU.

The State had granted the Federal Government access easements across all submerged lands in return for the Federal Government granting easements for State transportation projects across some identified corridors that were identified by a map in Section 4407

of the law. The act said, notwithstanding any other provision of law, this agreement was approved.

So now we have the Forest Service saying it cannot provide the easements within the corridors identified back in 2005 because of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) issues and concerns that NEPA reviews are required, and because the corridors aren't inventoried roadless area lands.

Looking at that letter and given the language of the Section 4407, it is just not acceptable. Congress exempted the corridors from NEPA. It exempted the corridors from inventoried roadless regs, even though, at the time, the roadless rules in effect in Alaska, because of the 2003 settlement agreement between the State and Forest Service—an agreement that the administration lost little time in not supporting once court review began again.

So I don't know whether you are on top of this issue. It just came to my attention. And again, it is very, very unsettling, and just not acceptable.

I don't know if you have comment on that at this time.

Mr. TIDWELL. Senator, I am not aware of this. I appreciate you bringing it up. I will look into it.

AIR TANKERS

Senator MURKOWSKI. All right, I would appreciate that. So we will talk back and forth on that.

Then the question that I alluded to in my opening was where we are with air tankers, and I don't think any colleagues have brought it up here this morning. But I think we all understand the need to modernize our air tanker fleet. The fiscal year 2015 omnibus provided \$65 million for air tanker modernization. I understand that at this point in time, you haven't finalized the plans to spend out the money, but a few questions about where you may be going with this.

Have you conducted a cost comparison between acquiring air tankers and contracting planes?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, with the funding that was provided in fiscal year 2015 to acquire an aircraft, we have entered into a contract to get a business case prepared to be able to look at what is the best way to move forward, which aircraft to acquire. We have done, in the past, some analysis between government-owned aircraft versus contract-owned aircraft, and we can provide the information that we put together on that. It is part of our overall strategy.

This year we will have 21 large air tankers under contract by the peak of the fire season, in addition to being able to bring down planes from Alaska and Canada. Then also, we always have the mass units that are in reserve for that.

Then we will be moving forward with bringing on the C-130Hs that were provided to us. We will have one late this fire season that will have a mass tank in it, and it will probably be around 2016 or 2017 before we bring those planes on.

We are looking at the cost to operate those government-owned versus contract. They are going to be comparable costs as far as operation and maintenance. We are going to contract out both the operation and the maintenance of those large air tankers. But we feel we need to have a mix of contracted aircraft and also government-

owned, just so that we are never in a position like we were a few years ago, where we had to cancel a contract and it put us in a really tough situation in the middle of fire season.

So having a combination of both where the government will own a few aircraft, and it will be contracted out for operation and maintenance, and then the majority of our fleet will be contracted aircraft, we see that as the best path forward.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So is that how you are going to be entering this coming fire season with this mix? And again, have you resolved or completed your analysis on the cost comparisons here?

Mr. TIDWELL. Well, we have done cost comparisons with the C-130Hs which are being provided to us. Those costs are going to be comparable to what we have with our contracted fleet.

This year, we will have all contracted aircraft. The first C-130H, we will bring it on probably late this year. It will have a mass tank in it. We will use the aircraft in some limited basis just understanding some of the changes we want the Air Force to make on them before we receive the other planes. But this year, we will be only operating with the contracted aircraft.

Senator MURKOWSKI. And then next, hopefully?

Mr. TIDWELL. They'll be coming on probably in 2016 and definitely in fiscal year 2017. We should have at least three of them.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Okay, thank you.

Senator Udall.

FOREST MANAGEMENT PLANS AND LAND GRANT HEIRS

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just a couple of more questions here, Chief, from me.

As you are probably aware, and I think we talked a little about it yesterday, but my State has a unique history with early Spanish settlers who received land grants from the King of Spain. We are talking now going back 400 years, in that range. These grants were subsequently recognized under Mexican law, and finally, to an extent, by the United States under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo at the end of the Mexican-American War.

These non-Indian traditional communities still practice activities they have practiced with their families for generations. They do things like harvesting pinon nuts in the forests. They collect latias, which are utilized in buildings. They gather wood for heating in the winter and a variety of other projects.

Most of the original land grant lands now overlap with Federal public lands primarily managed by the Forest Service, so it is important that these activities are considered during the current management plan revision process. As you know, your forest management plans are going through a revision in New Mexico, and that is happening in all of our national forests.

So will you commit to work with the land grant heirs in New Mexico to provide reasonable access and consultation on land management decisions?

Mr. TIDWELL. Senator, yes. Our foresters are already reaching out to these folks to make sure that they are involved in the forest planning. I think on the Cibola, they even have them signed up as a cooperating agency, which I think is probably even the best way for us to be able to move forward.

So we can make sure we are factoring in their traditional uses of the land in our planning. I feel very confident that we will be able to work closely with them to be able to continue these traditional uses.

FOREST SERVICE BILINGUAL OUTREACH

Senator UDALL. Great, thank you very much.

And, Chief, this is also related, because as you probably know, related to the last question, we have a large bilingual Hispanic population. I think the numbers is, in more than a third of the households in New Mexico, Spanish and English are spoken in the home. Many listen to Spanish-language radio and watch Spanish-language TV.

Can you talk about the Forest Service's bilingual outreach to Hispanic families and to Hispanics in New Mexico, if you are familiar with that?

Mr. TIDWELL. Yes, Senator. We have increased our efforts, not only our written products that are also produced in Spanish, but also to increase the opportunity where, if we need a translator in discussions we are having, whether it is with grazing permittees or just with operators, many of our employees in your State are also Spanish-speaking. So we are fortunate that we have that level of diversity in our workforce.

But we want to take every effort that is necessary so that there are ways that everyone understands the full benefits of their national forests, about how to take advantage of this, how to understand the rules and regulations. We know that we have to increase our efforts to make sure that we are communicating.

In your case, we are trying to make sure that all of our written materials are also put out in Spanish, and at the same time make sure we have the language skills necessary to be able to communicate effectively.

Senator UDALL. We actually have a constitutional requirement in New Mexico for bilingual materials at the State level, to show how much that Spanish history is reflected in our constitution.

LAS CONCHAS FIRE AND UTILITY COMPANIES

Let me also just ask a quick question. There is an issue with the Las Conchas fire. It was started by a downed power line, which brings up the issue of maintaining rights-of-way on Forest Service land that is really critical. I just wonder, is the Forest Service working with utilities to ensure that fires like the Las Conchas will never happen again, even without setting aside funding specifically for partnerships to do that, and working with these co-ops? And I think you are familiar with this issue.

Mr. TIDWELL. Senator, a few years ago, we increased our efforts to work with the utility companies, not only to ensure that their rights-of-way are cleared of hazardous materials, and reducing potential of a tree coming down on their lines, but also to work with them to be able to expand doing fuels treatment beyond the rights-of-way. Many of the companies recognize that even a fire that doesn't take down a line, if they have to shut it down because of the smoke impact, whether it is a few days or a week, that it re-

duces not only the effectiveness of the line, but it reduces their ability to collect revenues off of that line.

So we are actually expanding our work beyond the rights-of-way, but actually to work with them in a partnership where they have their equipment in there to be able to address larger areas to reduce the fuels, to eliminate those tragic situations when we do get a power line that comes down and starts a fire.

AIR TANKERS

Senator UDALL. Great.

Chairman Murkowski mentioned the Coast Guard C-130Hs and what you are working on there. I also believe it is urgent that we try to get your airplanes up and running, especially now that we are going to be heading into the fire season again. So however we can help on that, we really want to get that moving.

RESEARCH FUNDING QUESTIONS

I have a couple of other questions I will submit for the record. They involve cuts that involve research and things like that, which I am sure have been caused by the situation we have with your forest fire funding in your agency. We have a situation where you have to pull money out to fight fires, and so some of the other crucial areas are cut.

So I will submit those for the record, and really appreciate the hearing today, Madam Chair.

TIMBER HARVEST

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Senator Udall.

And, Chief, thank you for being here with us this morning. Again, I acknowledge that you do have a tough job in balancing so much when it comes to management of our forests and the multiple use requirement.

I know that we talk a lot about we have to resolve the fire borrowing, because that has kind of infiltrated decisions in so many other areas. But I think we also need to be honest that it doesn't all come back to fire borrowing. We can't blame it all.

There are some policies that I think we have seen the administration take that have moved us away from that part of the multiple use which is managing our forests for timber harvest. I think that has been a policy decision that has shifted, whether it is in Montana or whether it is in Alaska or other parts of the country.

So I would like us to get to that point where, again, we have agreement that our forests are a renewable resource, a renewable resource that needs to be managed, and carefully managed. The better we manage them, I think we know that works to reduce some of the hazardous fuels risks that we have and that we pay for.

So as you move forward with implementation of your policies under these budgets, I think it is important that you hear where this subcommittee is coming from. And I think there have been several asks of members for you to work with them in a specific direction. I know we, certainly, have that. And I appreciate your willingness to do so.

But again, I do share a little bit of the concern and, perhaps, disappointment that we have not been able to do better by some of our timber-reliant communities across the country.

So again, Chief, I appreciate your leadership in difficult areas, and I thank you for coming before the subcommittee this morning.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the Department for response subsequent to the hearing:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO TOM TIDWELL

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR LISA MURKOWSKI

Question. The budget request calls for an overall reduction to Research and Development of about \$4 million from the 2015 level. And, within this overall reduction is a proposed increase of \$13 million in the Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program. As a supporter of FIA, I am glad the Service has acknowledged the importance of the program and requested enough funding to extend FIA to interior Alaska. It is my understanding that the request is upwards of \$5 million more than necessary to keep funding robust and to expand the program.

What activities would the additional \$13 million fund?

Answer. The Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) Strategic Plan recently submitted to Congress, identifies the \$13 million to cover implementation for all of Alaska including interior Alaska. The increase also enables a 5-year measurement cycle in the eastern United States:

- production of annual reports on renewable biomass supplies and carbon stocks at multiple spatial scales inclusive of ownership categories;
- annualized forest products monitoring system with improved coverage of secondary manufacturing industries using wood;
- enhanced remote sensing research and applications for immediate operational improvement of land cover and land use monitoring;
- an improved National Woodland Owner Survey to determine the goals and objectives of private forest land owners, including Timber Management Organizations and Real Estate Investments Trusts; and
- implementation of urban FIA in selected cities with State and local partnership support.

Question. What will be the impacts of the non-FIA reduction to the Forest and Rangeland Research be to capacity and output?

Answer. The decrease to non-FIA work will not prevent other research projects from moving forward, but it will slow progress on both new and existing projects. Research on hazardous reduction, a very important component of healthy forest management that is focused on finding cost-effective ways to use biomass and promote healthy, sustainable forests that are more resilient to catastrophic fire, will be affected. The Forest Service will take steps to minimize the impact of the proposed funding reduction on our existing staff. If reductions to the workforce occur, it will be through not filling vacant positions.

Question. What would the impact of the budget request be on the Forest Service's focus on biomass uses and market development and expansion for non-merchantable timber products?

Answer. In fiscal year 2016, we are requesting \$32.3 million for biomass-related projects. Approximately \$10 million would go towards grants to expand wood energy and wood products markets in order to support active forest management on National Forest System lands. In addition, we will continue to support the use of State-wide Wood Energy Teams to facilitate State efforts to make use of small-diameter wood generated from National Forest System and other forest lands with high wild-fire risk. These funds would leverage additional matching support and bring more partners to the table in areas of the country with the most promising opportunities to expand markets for both wood energy and wood products.

Question. According to the Forest Service's cut and sold reports for fiscal year 2014, stewardship contracts provided 30 percent of the timber volume sold in 2014, up from 27.5 percent last year, and up from less than 5 percent in 2004. In 2014 this authority was made permanent. You told this committee that you would begin the Rulemaking process to add Stewardship Integrated Resource Timber Contracts

to the Small Business Administration Set-Aside Program as soon as stewardship contracting was reauthorized.

What is the status of that rulemaking?

Answer. The Forest Service has joined with the Small Business Administration (SBA) to prepare a joint Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making (ANPRM). The SBA published an ANPRM, in the Federal Register on March 25, 2015 (80 FR 15697–99), to solicit public comments on two main items:

- The possibility of including saw timber volume sold as part of a stewardship timber or stewardship services contract in the calculation of the timber sale share of small business;
- How timber sale appraisals should be performed for small business set aside sales and associated costs and benefits to stakeholders (i.e. should appraisals be to the nearest SBA mill or remain to the nearest mill).

The actual 5-year re-computation process will take place during October 2015 through March 2016, with the new small business market share(s) effective October 1, 2015. Under the current schedule the SBA rule should be completed before the 5-year re-computation of the SBA Set-Aside Program.

Question. The retrofitted Coast Guard C130s are scheduled to begin coming online late this year. It seems to me that this is an opportunity to see if the Forest Service can effectively manage and maintain a fleet of large air tankers.

Do you think it is wise for the Forest Service to purchase an air tanker without first evaluating the cost and effectiveness of an in-house fleet versus contracted planes?

Answer. The Forest Service has determined an in-house fleet as well as a contracted fleet makes the most financial sense. Owning a fleet of airtankers and contracting for aircrews, Integrated Logistics Support, and maintenance (field and depot level) is cost effective in the long run due to the ability to utilize the aircraft throughout the year for missions in support of both agency fire and resource objectives. This year-round operational model is not possible with the single purpose airtanker offered by private industry. Additionally, the majority of the overhead cost and additional personnel required to manage and maintain the aviation assets would be transferred to a contractor, providing the greatest flexibility to the agency.

Question. Do you know how many support staff it will take to operate and maintain each C130H per year, and the annual cost of those services?

Answer. Direct contract maintenance support of the aircraft during Initial Operating Capability (IOC) will require a crew of 7 and a possibility of a surge to 13 should there be 2 aircraft available at the same time. This is estimated to cost \$1.193 million in fiscal year 2015 and \$1.73 million in fiscal year 2016. The flight crew contract consists of one program manager and five crew members: two pilots, one flight engineer and two loadmasters. The annual cost for this flight crew contract is \$1.71 million in fiscal year 2015 and \$2.27 million in fiscal year 2016. The U.S. Coast Guard will also provide operational, training, engineering, maintenance, and logistics support through an Interagency Agreement. USCG support is estimated to cost the Forest Service \$3.9 million in fiscal year 2015 and \$2.3 million in fiscal year 2016. The total cost for contracts and interagency support to operate and maintain the first two MAFFS equipped HC-130H aircraft is \$6.8 million in fiscal year 2015 and \$6.3 million in fiscal year 2016.

Forest Service government employees will provide contract and operational oversight to one aircraft during fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2016. Two full-time employees will support the aircraft in fiscal year 2015 at a cost of \$230,000. Another six employees will support the HC-130H program on a part-time basis; approximately one-third of each employee's overall time. The cost for these employees in fiscal year 2015 is \$197,000. The total cost in fiscal year 2015 for Federal employee support to the HC-130H program (and one operational aircraft) is \$427,000. Government oversight will remain approximately the same with one aircraft or with multiple aircraft.

Question. The administration has once again proposed doubling the amount of funding for the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration programs, despite of the fact that the agency either met or exceeded its goals on only 2 of the 12 performance measures. I continue to be concerned that this program is becoming simply another budget line item to fund work that could otherwise be accomplished better through other budget line items. There are many opportunities outside of CFLR to expand management nationwide.

What assurances can you give me that current and future projects selected for this program will specifically meet all of its criteria and are not simply work that could be accomplished outside the program umbrella?

Answer. The Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Advisory Committee evaluates project proposals and makes recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture (USDA) to make selections. The committee evaluates proposals based on how well the projects fulfill the purposes of the authorizing legislation. Specifically, whether the projects:

- encourage collaborative, science-based restoration; support ecological, economic, and social sustainability;
- leverage local, national, and private resources; facilitate the reduction of wild-fire management costs; and
- demonstrate varied approaches to achieve ecological and watershed health objectives, and; use forest restoration byproducts to offset treatment costs.

Question. How has the CFLR program reduced unit costs, either for acres treated or per unit of wood produced?

Answer. One example of a project finding efficiency through collaboration and large landscape restoration is the Four Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI) in Arizona. 4FRI has issued 19 task orders to date, with an average per acre payment to the government of \$41.15 per acre on 18 of those task orders. Task orders under a previous 10-year stewardship contract, White Mountain, cost the government an average of \$500 per acre. Through conversations with partners and the focus on a large landscape in the phase one contract—in addition to the growth of markets in northern Arizona—the project has helped create opportunities to generate net gains and increase capacity for restoration work. Ultimately, these contracts will have a positive impact on watershed function and resilience and hazardous fuels reduction while creating economic activity in local communities.

Question. How have CFLR projects reduced litigation or expedited project completion?

Answer. Several projects have seen large landscape decisions approved without appeals or objections, and as a member of the Uncompahgre Partnership in Colorado stated, “there is no way a 17,000 acre decision would not have been appealed without collaboration.” By supporting project collaboration, the CFLRP program enables groups to address larger landscapes. The Deschutes Skyline project is a part of a 25,000 acre NEPA decision, bolstered by the success of a thinning project that was the first on the district to not be litigated in 13 years. Former litigants are now collaborators, acting as educators for the treatments proposed and carried out by the Forest Service.

Question. Do you have data showing that CFLR project areas have reduced NEPA costs and increased the speed with which NEPA analysis is completed?

Answer. We are not able to compare the speed and cost of NEPA between CFLR and non-CFLR projects because the average length of time required to reach a decision on a NEPA process varies greatly depending on many factors including: the extent of collaboration, size of analysis area, and natural resource issues specific to that project. Regardless of the program, we continue to look for opportunities to increase the scale of our analyses because it has the potential to save us more time by completing a single NEPA analysis as opposed to multiple analyses.

Question. How many actual acres have been treated in CFLR project areas compared with non-CFLR acres since 2010? Do you know if those numbers represent increases or decreases based on the NFS unit’s prior performance?

Answer. The tables below show: (1) key performance measure accomplishments for the CFLR projects from 2010–2014; and (2) key performance measure accomplishments for the entirety of the National Forest units that contain part of a CFLR landscape from 2010–2014.

Comparing these numbers provides a sense for what portion of overall National Forest accomplishments came from activities on the CFLRP landscape.

TABLE 1: CFLRP ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY PROJECT AREA

[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014
<i>Four Forest Restoration Initiative:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	1,921	121	11,360	3,833	2,660	19,896
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	12,764	8,864	4,712	24,519	18,409	69,269

TABLE 1: CFLRP ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY PROJECT AREA—Continued

[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..	382,357	220,977	275,483	728,557	92,747	1,700,121
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	48,546	5,587	9,032	8,082	25,178	96,425
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	51,126	28,816	28,798	57,229	37,214	203,183
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	5,202	2,546	2,302	3,892	530	14,472
Roads decommissioned (miles)	0	0	35	9	19	62
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	15	0	2	0	34	50
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	59,745	99,751	10,167	48,570	86,043	304,276
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	69	47	51	128	92	387
<i>Burney Hat Creek Basins:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			962	313	332	1,607
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			1,472	1,040	2,113	4,625
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..			27,402	33	18,754	46,189
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			1,329	624	2,640	4,592
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			1,677	496	738	2,911
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			0	0	0	0
Roads decommissioned (miles)			0	0	0	0
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)			0	0	0	0
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)			974	540	980	2,494
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			13	30	16	59
<i>Colorado Front Range:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	0	1,047	1,100	1,564	1,199	4,910
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	1,091	5,370	2,181	5,758	5,414	19,814
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..	5,514	1,128	459	260	0	7,361
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	0	0	0	0	969	969
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	3,224	8,291	5,506	9,625	6,530	33,176
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	100	1,050	625	429	477	2,681
Roads decommissioned (miles)	0	4	5	0	7	16
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	0	0	0	0	4	4
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	0	1,407	6,615	1,414	4,163	13,599
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	8	3	6	3	3	23

TABLE 1: CFLRP ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY PROJECT AREA—Continued

[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014
<i>Aador Calaveras Cornerstone:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			0	0	0	0
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			1,348	303	1,429	3,079
Green tons of biomass made avail- able for bioenergy (green tons) ..			0	0	2,340	2,340
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Out- side the Wildland Urban Inter- face (acres)			121	2,711	0	2,832
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			558	1,957	927	3,441
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			163	171	47	381
Roads decommissioned (miles)			0	0	0	0
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)			4	2	1	7
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or En- hanced (acres)			676	1,032	53	1,761
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			0	12	0.4	12
<i>Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	0	0	240	394	2,125	2,759
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	0	983	1,486	1,356	2,371	6,196
Green tons of biomass made avail- able for bioenergy (green tons) ..	8,817	29,458	18,515	2,274	4,825	63,888
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Out- side the Wildland Urban Inter- face (acres)	0	66	30	0	4,071	4,167
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	18,828	5,440	7,654	11,570	10,453	53,945
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	0	973	1,422	1,140	2,085	5,620
Roads decommissioned (miles)	0	0	3	2	0	5
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)	1	16	9	7	13	45
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or En- hanced (acres)	0	975	2,524	5,057	10	8,566
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	3	8	8	2	24	45
<i>Dinkey Project:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	28	535	33	56	2	654
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	43	1,052	977	1,578	368	4,017
Green tons of biomass made avail- able for bioenergy (green tons) ..	3,630	8,948	1,291	0	0	13,869
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Out- side the Wildland Urban Inter- face (acres)	1,650	384	2,790	862	2,062	7,748
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	1,500	3,826	948	3,300	1,864	11,438
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	0	9	0	0	0	9
Roads decommissioned (miles)	0	0	0	0	0
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)	0	1	0	0	0	1
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or En- hanced (acres)	0	4,051	0	4,800	2,619	11,470

TABLE 1: CFLRP ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY PROJECT AREA—Continued

[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	0	8	7	2	1	19
<i>Grandfather Restoration Project:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			0	0	44	44
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			312	523	339	1,174
Green tons of biomass made avail- able for bioenergy (green tons) ..			0	0	0	0
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Out- side the Wildland Urban Inter- face (acres)			71	309		380
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			5,191	5,322	3,439	13,952
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			127	15	0	142
Roads decommissioned (miles)			0	0		0
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)			0	3	3	6
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or En- hanced (acres)			2,129	6	5,345	7,480
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			4	0	1	5
<i>Kootenai Valley Rhode Island:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			76	657	143	876
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			238	484	561	1,283
Green tons of biomass made avail- able for bioenergy (green tons) ..			2,745	585	10,646	13,976
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Out- side the Wildland Urban Inter- face (acres)			0	0	262	262
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			707	723	2,414	3,844
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			413	409	543	1,365
Roads decommissioned (miles)			1	0	1	2
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)			3	2	6	10
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or En- hanced (acres)			0	0	2,572	2,572
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			10	3	21	34
<i>Lakeview Stewardship:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			319	537	5,251	6,107
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			6,107	3,614	11,879	21,600
Green tons of biomass made avail- able for bioenergy (green tons) ..			0	0	14	14
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Out- side the Wildland Urban Inter- face (acres)			14,888	8,546	19,248	42,682
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			4,608	0	14,784	19,392
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			1,036	516	704	2,256
Roads decommissioned (miles)			0	0	16	16
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)			141	9	10	160

TABLE 1: CFLRP ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY PROJECT AREA—Continued

[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)			2,654	4,159	19,646	26,459
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			0	2	15	17
<i>Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration and Hazardous Fuels Reduction:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			0	148	269	417
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			0	614	127	741
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..			187	3		190
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			261	0		261
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			51,181	85,440	86,914	223,535
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			150	0	439	589
Roads decommissioned (miles)			7	0		7
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)			3	0	0	3
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)			86,851	120,276	99,954	307,081
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			3	10	16	29
<i>Longleaf Pine in Florida:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	3,649	1,359	2,678	2,338	1,693	11,717
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	1,500	554	2,115	3,119	4,407	11,695
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..	0	0	105	1	0	105
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	8,830	15,578	40,134	3,907	4,320	72,769
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	4,285	18,985	12,628	25,401	37,817	99,116
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	0	0	80	0	0	80
Roads decommissioned (miles)	0	16	16	16		48
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	1,300	42,592	12,114	3,015	0	59,021
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	0	13	24	5	29	71
<i>Missouri Pine Oak:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			0	252	787	1,039
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			5,920	657	6,072	12,649
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..			0	0	6,307	6,307
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			3,772	9,621	11,793	25,186
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			13,570	0	8,323	21,893
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			0	153	354	508

TABLE 1: CFLRP ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY PROJECT AREA—Continued

[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014
Roads decommissioned (miles)			0	0		0
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)			0	0	0	0
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)			20,174	1,760	10,850	32,784
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			2	13	11	25
<i>Northeast Washington Forest Vision:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			79	0	0	79
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			739	2,157	2,221	5,117
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..			0	0		0
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			1,268	672	298	2,238
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			6,745	4,709	5,181	16,635
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			534	0	0	534
Roads decommissioned (miles)			0	0		0
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)			9	0	12	21
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)			1,679	0	5,181	6,860
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			19	17	11	46
<i>Ozark Highlands Ecosystem Restoration:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			39	251	268	558
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			466	2,177	1,691	4,334
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..			0	0		0
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			3,336	10,022	9,758	23,116
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			14,820	15,033	3,296	33,149
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			2,089	3,328	1,503	6,920
Roads decommissioned (miles)			0	0		0
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)			15	21	37	73
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)			34,058	56,887	48,313	139,257
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			3	18	3	23
<i>Selway-Middle Fork:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	148	0	0	0	18	166
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	19	616	616	498	18	1,767
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..	0	938	1,217	15	860	3,030
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	1,755	16,700	13,389	23,917	665	56,426

TABLE 1: CFLRP ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY PROJECT AREA—Continued

[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	317	3,404	1,094	0	25	4,840
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	2,597	3,404	4,110	3,595	1,116	14,821
Roads decommissioned (miles)	0	8	27	24	6	66
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)	0	4	32	19	9	63
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or En- hanced (acres)	0	0	13,166	1,860	750	15,776
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf)*	0	8	5	0.1	7	20
<i>Shortleaf Bluestem Community:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			140	1,085	665	1,890
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres) Green tons of biomass made avail- able for bioenergy (green tons) ..			1,330	2,332	1,093	4,755
			5,391	7,024	6,742	19,157
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Out- side the Wildland Urban Inter- face (acres)			16,469	28,561	12,498	57,528
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			33,120	33,041	38,709	104,870
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			23	0	21	44
Roads decommissioned (miles)			19	0	1	20
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)			0	0	0	0
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or En- hanced (acres)			57,937	103,023	75,421	236,381
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			34	41	47	121
<i>Southern Blues Restoration Coalition:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			0	0	0	0
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres) Green tons of biomass made avail- able for bioenergy (green tons) ..			1,044	10,017	5,039	16,100
			13,013	6,509	13,031	32,553
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Out- side the Wildland Urban Inter- face (acres)			3,544	22,251	20,483	46,278
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			8,247	8,268	5,788	22,302
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			0	0	72	72
Roads decommissioned (miles)			0	0		0
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)			14	0	11	25
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or En- hanced (acres)			9,832	4,932	923	15,687
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹			24	48	60	132
<i>Southwest Crown:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	1,755	1,916	2,650	2,879	1,615	10,815
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres) Green tons of biomass made avail- able for bioenergy (green tons) ..	0	76	259	621	1,857	2,813
	131,870	6,441	728	95	5,315	144,449

TABLE 1: CFLRP ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY PROJECT AREA—Continued

[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	1,089	2,352	641	2,047	1,207	7,336
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	4,141	1,877	1,917	1,847	3,331	13,113
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	0	2,960	5,447	1,596	242	10,245
Roads decommissioned (miles)	0	11	0	25	23	58
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	0	14	52	7	28	102
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	0	11,201	7,598	7,054	2,270	28,123
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	23	13	0.8	1	16	53
<i>Southwest Jemez Mountains on the Santa Fe National Forest:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	890	649	861	720	106	3,226
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..	3,000	0	0	887	10,464	14,351
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	0	326	0	2,906	0	3,232
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	1,623	3,623	2,668	5,420	6,242	19,576
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	0	4	21	87	60	171
Roads decommissioned (miles)	0	11	0	3	0	14
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	12	2	3	0	0	17
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	1,933	640	3,546	4,806	4,000	14,925
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	0.8	0	0	0.6	2	3
<i>Tapash:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	600	371	0	1,197	631	2,799
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	0	0	1,104	4	3,040	4,148
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	5,100	0	3,869	794	2,893	12,656
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	0	0	1,318	679	1,969	3,966
Roads decommissioned (miles)	0	0	0	0	4	4
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	0	1	0	4	10	14
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	0	2,907	746	1,657	12,490	17,800
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	1	15	7	13	10	46
<i>Uncompahgre Plateau:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	401	559	295	0	147	1,402

TABLE 1: CFLRP ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY PROJECT AREA—Continued

[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	261	2,026	1,205	0	765	4,257
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	1,782	4,891	771	339	3,652	11,435
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	556	2,871	723	678	336	5,164
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	610	448	222	392	745	2,418
Roads decommissioned (miles)	30	0	30	36	13	109
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	0	1	2	15	0	18
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	2,943	3,739	8,202	7,438	2,000	24,322
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	3	6	3	5	3	20
<i>Weiser Little Salmon Headwaters:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			1,053	1,232	737	3,022
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			2,409	948	2,697	6,054
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..			8,559	10,640	35,360	54,559
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			6,675	16,531	16,042	39,248
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			7,480	3,706	2,529	13,714
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			2,169	1,778	2,365	6,312
Roads decommissioned (miles)			33	37	30	100
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)			37	24	23	84
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)			22,872	18,146	15,534	56,552
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf)*			13	12	23	48
<i>Zuni Mountains:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)			0	0	0	0
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)			0	3,279	3,763	7,042
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons) ..			0	0	4,463	4,463
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			0	0		0
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)			1,700	3,407	4,144	9,251
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)			0	0	0	0
Roads decommissioned (miles)			0	0	4	4
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)			0	0	0	0
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)			120	1,800	744	2,664
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf)*			4	6	6	16

¹ Official Timber Volume Sold by National Forest comes from official PTSAR (Periodic Timber Sale Attainment Reports) which provides volume in both hundred cubic feet (ccf)—converted here to million board feet (mmbf).

TOTAL CFLRP 5 YEAR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	67,957
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	214,406
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	2,126,922
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	509,256
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	945,097
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	73,605
Roads decommissioned (miles)	530
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	703
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	1,335,909
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	1,256

¹ Official Timber Volume Sold by National Forest comes from official PTSAR (Periodic Timber Sale Attainment Reports) which provides volume in both hundred cubic feet (ccf)—converted here to million board feet (mmbf).

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS

[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
<i>Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, Kaibab, and Tonto National Forests—Four Forest Restoration Initiative:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	2,820	1,817	11,750	4,691	3,562	24,640
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	13,916	11,587	6,751	25,490	20,566	78,310
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	404,374	375,049	408,201	906,136	204,864	2,298,625
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	62,255	53,438	32,432	22,587	63,986	234,698
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	53,336	53,487	36,857	59,828	61,964	265,471
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	8,165	6,573	6,705	8,584	8,871	38,897
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	19	1	42	0	0	61
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	43	69	72	124	66	374
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	107,982	194,945	59,199	194,147	115,607	671,879
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	85	76	70	154	117	502
<i>Arapaho-Roosevelt and Pike San Isabel National Forests—Colorado Front Range:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	4,048	3,516	2,925	3,636	2,992	17,118
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	2,996	8,040	5,584	7,145	6,808	30,573
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	62,756	33,409	22,345	23,943	20,780	163,233
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	5,279	4,446	6,521	2,366	3,220	21,833
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	21,009	17,840	14,881	16,761	14,091	84,582

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS—Continued
[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	4,914	8,148	7,466	8,113	12,003	40,644
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	12	51	29	0	0	91
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	13	20	28	24	41	125
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	4,705	25,744	32,474	37,519	36,564	137,006
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	28	23	26	20	29	127
<i>Cibola National Forest—Zuni Mountain:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	611	373	0	0	0	984
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	2,316	834	602	5,616	8,616	17,984
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	36,460	43,822	32,346	35,300	21,682	169,610
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	11,065	6,380	3,258	1,658	1,506	23,867
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	8,107	3,641	2,582	5,887	9,101	29,318
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	1,016	925	559	504	126	3,129
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	0	2	1	1	1	5
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	21,878	20,075	17,520	18,924	28,719	107,116
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	7	12	12	13	11	56
<i>Clearwater National Forest (Now part of the Nez Perce Clearwater National Forest)—Selway-Middle Fork:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	4,310	3,454	2,730	693	0	11,187
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	4,056	2,844	2,177	2,083	0	11,160
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	24,128	28,398	27,283	19,737	0	99,546
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	7,134	12,283	8,771	19,970	0	48,158
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	2,718	1,722	1,671	811	0	6,922
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	19,041	1,143	4,810	2,095	0	27,090
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	28	35	24	0	0	87
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	88	68	42	0	0	198
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	7,000	12,825	11,141	0	0	30,966
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	23	36	21	32	0	113

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS—Continued
[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
<i>Colville National Forest—Northeast Washington Vision 2020:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	770	585	609	880	480	3,324
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	4,944	481	1,741	4,423	3,218	14,807
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	51,763	37,275	46,407	27,504	23,529	186,479
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	9,389	1,107	2,151	1,064	1,933	15,644
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	12,240	6,797	15,085	5,683	7,639	47,444
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	2,093	1,995	2,281	2,011	2,246	10,626
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	1	6	3	0	0	11
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	15	25	27	17	34	118
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	9,654	6,788	6,606	39,568	13,990	76,606
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	48	41	37	47	48	221
<i>Deschutes National Forest—Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	5,992	6,212	4,824	3,306	5,595	25,928
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	34,033	17,324	10,200	6,320	7,352	75,229
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	79,055	74,130	71,286	57,050	36,878	318,399
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	57,479	17,611	17,701	16,451	23,587	132,829
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	32,927	28,166	32,808	23,368	22,869	140,138
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	5,417	3,793	6,095	6,329	6,833	28,466
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	7	1	40	0	0	48
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	5	21	18	17	20	80
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	1,563	33,208	15,830	23,641	30,784	105,026
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	54	52	61	61	57	283
<i>Eldorado and Stanislaus National Forests—Amador Calaveras Cornerstone:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	380	330	471	199	196	1,576
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	7,377	6,244	5,318	1,645	2,493	23,077
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	84,027	90,252	71,239	22,094	44,018	311,630

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS—Continued
[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	11,385	11,078	13,287	9,144	9,059	53,953
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	8,989	6,832	2,640	3,444	5,019	26,924
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	752	757	816	725	914	3,964
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	1	0	1	0	0
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	23	17	36	39	38	154
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	2,344	25,476	21,960	11,422	14,071	75,272
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	52	42	58	33	96	281
<i>Flathead, Helena, and Lolo National Forests—Southwest Crown of the Continent:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	14,689	18,852	16,947	7,034	9,428	66,950
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	5,334	2,673	1,297	3,482	2,344	15,130
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	127,024	115,768	100,166	87,458	115,952	546,368
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	13,347	15,252	8,761	18,668	7,461	63,488
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	15,447	14,195	9,463	8,026	16,445	63,576
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	13,770	16,505	10,188	11,877	9,868	62,209
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	84	45	63	0	0	192
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	91	47	82	52	111	384
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	16,504	36,678	57,563	47,529	89,467	247,740
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	77	63	43	25	71	278
<i>Fremont-Winema National Forest—Lakeview Stewardship:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	947	1,238	1,536	1,511	6,233	11,465
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	18,966	7,785	18,850	10,083	23,743	79,428
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	119,078	62,829	45,046	51,636	35,806	314,394
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	43,398	22,700	49,415	17,674	37,709	170,897
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	8,409	6,535	10,890	34,007	21,977	81,818
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	2,697	1,792	2,555	2,247	2,759	12,051
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS—Continued
[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	152	88	144	21	28	434
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	14,499	21,017	32,969	30,877	32,687	132,048
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	58	42	68	36	60	264
<i>Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre-Gunnison National Forest—Uncompahgre Plateau:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	707	669	2,500	355	1,873	6,104
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	316	2,270	1,733	215	789	5,324
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	18,070	18,342	16,887	17,389	15,868	86,556
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	1,877	6,184	2,870	3,839	6,287	21,057
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	2,013	4,444	1,397	1,707	532	10,093
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	5,225	6,686	1,759	1,304	2,249	17,223
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	30	149	156	0	0	335
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	9	35	25	28	27	124
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	5,528	36,647	45,772	15,228	33,223	136,398
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	10	13	25	23	30	101
<i>Idaho Panhandle National Forests—Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	897	1,342	1,461	1,499	1,141	6,340
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	9,846	4,848	3,566	3,300	4,327	25,887
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	69,904	66,441	70,776	66,898	62,407	336,425
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	7,620	6,636	4,414	3,892	2,473	25,035
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	3,479	3,609	4,157	3,983	4,132	19,359
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	3,075	3,600	3,038	2,330	3,251	15,293
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	26	14	9	0	0	49
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	22	13	10	6	38	88
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	10,888	30,038	21,494	9,766	30,073	102,259
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	33	24	45	40	44	186
<i>Lassen National Forest—Burney Hat Creek Basins:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	1,512	703	1,520	1,160	924	5,819

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS—Continued
[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	8,961	7,424	8,341	4,439	5,002	34,167
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	124,145	158,484	129,096	70,051	86,847	568,623
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	18,358	11,500	11,594	7,210	9,809	58,469
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	2,683	5,033	2,824	2,884	1,783	15,206
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	192	493	90	60	50	886
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	7	9	1	0	0	17
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	25	32	14	9	19	98
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	11,982	6,286	6,134	4,012	5,151	33,565
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	34	56	40	54	31	215
<i>Malheur National Forest—Southern Blues Restoration Coalition:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	4,767	4,588	4,219	6,135	4,251	23,959
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	15,097	3,977	4,979	13,628	7,416	45,097
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	22,361	19,238	32,587	29,744	33,231	137,161
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	26,298	7,714	12,205	32,471	32,606	111,293
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	17,246	18,247	13,894	12,975	8,940	71,302
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	410	203	43	322	364	1,341
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	29	3	0	0	0	32
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	23	29	33	16	32	133
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	33,173	31,314	27,176	29,220	31,776	152,659
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	39	29	34	55	70	227
<i>Mark Twain National Forest—Missouri Pine Oak:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	5,077	5,838	6,828	6,483	6,343	30,569
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	3,635	4,004	8,773	2,361	6,963	25,736
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	27,345	22,541	16,592	12,844	39,276	118,597
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	52,680	35,661	26,643	26,731	31,675	173,391
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	13,631	10,272	32,534	7,848	37,920	102,205

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS—Continued
[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	4,936	3,930	871	2,104	2,399	14,241
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	28	0	35	0	0	63
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)	1	24	85	28	74	211
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	29,307	70,912	68,468	52,826	64,810	286,322
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	47	46	38	50	54	235
<i>National Forests in Florida—Accelerating Longleaf Pine:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	10,465	4,016	5,044	5,305	3,404	28,234
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	2,553	1,202	2,381	3,852	5,292	15,280
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	1,577	2,213	1,203	1,323	956	7,271
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Out- side the Wildland Urban Inter- face (acres)	75,960	77,558	58,206	46,620	49,010	307,354
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	171,762	82,542	70,996	126,105	151,932	603,337
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	341	394	496	504	427	2,162
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	39	30	47	0	0	116
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)	33	27	33	860	56	1,009
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	142,274	172,003	302,847	218,666	181,883	1,017,673
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	22	32	42	32	55	183
<i>National Forests in Mississippi—Longleaf Pine Eco- system Restoration and Haz- ardous Fuels Reduction:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	977	819	1,445	2,120	954	6,315
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	3,006	1,688	1,643	1,906	773	9,016
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	7,824	1,162	4,002	773	481	14,242
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Out- side the Wildland Urban Inter- face (acres)	22,451	16,330	15,307	4,045	4,277	62,410
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	222,365	108,544	158,739	193,547	198,300	881,495
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	3,536	3,804	2,710	32	495	10,576
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	140	27	116	0	0	283
Stream Habitat Restored or En- hanced (miles)	6	40	40	52	38	176
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	187,446	132,324	191,577	324,785	241,605	1,077,737
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	75	64	72	58	77	346

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS—Continued
[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
<i>National Forests in North Carolina—Grandfather Restoration Project:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	463	23,708	6,894	1,137	796	32,997
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	3,496	3,632	5,193	4,011	3,897	20,228
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	8,874	8,289	6,711	8,181	8,382	40,437
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	18,045	17,711	3,043	3,046	9,592	51,438
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	29,561	20,110	36,234	29,354	25,265	140,524
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	326	712	1,190	1,355	799	4,382
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	16	1	2	0	0	19
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	55	55	61	39	29	239
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	3,446	35,764	11,845	9,518	37,120	97,691
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	17	27	22	16	18	100
<i>Nez Perce National Forest—Selway-Middle Fork:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	2,691	3,280	2,323	2,831	3,023	14,148
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	1,263	1,088	1,129	879	2,769	7,128
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	20,872	23,841	23,593	15,680	55,745	139,732
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	2,237	13,355	13,826	22,424	10,112	61,954
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	2,297	5,048	4,576	180	7,683	19,784
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	5,690	6,098	8,623	7,673	6,946	35,030
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	79	35	44	0	0	159
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	53	73	53	95	78	352
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	7,000	16,035	20,740	15,202	10,911	69,888
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	15	16	18	12	56	117
<i>Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest—Tapash:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	2,416	4,325	4,912	3,960	7,775	23,388
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	5,709	3,750	3,657	4,004	2,630	19,750
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	51,082	54,916	47,365	49,053	38,263	240,678

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS—Continued
[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	8,177	2,130	3,782	3,943	3,916	21,947
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	27,252	22,328	19,545	43,697	24,836	137,657
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	10,559	10,046	5,786	5,892	8,001	40,285
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	11	20	4	0	0	35
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	8	5	110	23	34	179
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	18,865	27,468	15,660	2,804	49,395	114,192
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	56	53	42	34	37	221
<i>Ouachita National Forest—Shortleaf Bluestem Community:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	10,601	8,119	4,850	7,022	4,175	34,766
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	9,332	7,216	7,673	5,449	9,267	38,937
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	8,369	13,217	15,694	13,415	13,838	64,532
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	74,721	63,193	50,449	55,274	24,683	268,320
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	75,592	46,371	69,978	70,081	89,053	351,075
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	430	290	374	400	536	2,030
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	0	0	56	0	0	56
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	30	165	64	42	40	341
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	122,827	145,791	132,701	210,270	152,321	763,910
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	95	100	89	77	85	446
<i>Ozark St Francis National Forest—Ozark Highlands:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	3,238	2,304	1,417	1,639	1,832	10,430
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	4,481	5,936	11,460	5,599	5,440	32,916
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	5,364	3,165	2,574	2,844	3,399	17,346
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	61,528	42,579	22,707	15,690	28,653	171,157
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	31,010	17,520	44,031	42,604	26,050	161,214
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	3,235	3,446	3,090	3,971	4,730	18,473
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	1	2	52	0	0	55
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	64	62	87	71	88	371

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS—Continued
[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	82,655	82,557	133,569	120,757	156,508	576,046
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	58	58	58	53	66	294
<i>Payette National Forest—Weiser-Little Salmon Headwaters:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	1,174	1,652	1,841	1,232	737	6,636
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	5,387	1,978	2,409	948	2,697	13,419
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	46,608	33,338	29,033	24,127	49,572	182,677
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	12,441	1,585	6,935	28,988	16,042	65,991
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	14,495	13,365	8,449	3,711	4,227	44,245
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	3,157	2,798	2,714	2,709	3,410	14,788
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	53	20	33	0	0	106
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	38	14	48	49	39	189
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	10,713	5,582	24,116	28,279	16,996	85,686
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	28	27	19	15	27	115
<i>Santa Fe National Forest—Southwest Jemez Mountains:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	109	552	157	2,359	795	3,972
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	1,260	1,061	1,745	1,619	1,098	6,783
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	64,765	59,548	55,496	54,161	50,040	284,010
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	22,723	3,469	1,761	16,279	3,175	47,407
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	8,540	7,760	4,379	6,777	10,166	37,622
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	436	298	306	171	337	1,548
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	0	11	0	0	0	11
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	20	19	18	12	19	87
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	7,869	6,355	11,431	6,090	7,290	39,035
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	15	14	13	12	12	67
<i>Sierra National Forest—Dinkey Project:</i>						
Forest Vegetation Established (acres)	267	836	138	229	170	1,640
Forest Vegetation Improved (acres)	2,583	3,075	2,093	2,789	1,478	12,018

TABLE 2: TOTAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY ACTIVITIES FOR NATIONAL FORESTS WITH CFLRP PROJECT AREAS—Continued
[Fiscal Year 2010 to Fiscal Year 2014]

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Accomplishments Forests With CFLR Projects
Green tons of biomass made available for bioenergy (green tons)	16,073	21,914	11,842	11,445	8,247	69,521
Hazardous Fuels Treatments Outside the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	5,135	1,703	3,645	3,201	5,265	18,949
Hazardous Fuels Treatments within the Wildland Urban Interface (acres)	4,514	4,951	2,111	5,442	2,293	19,311
Invasive Plant and Noxious Weed Treatments (acres)	109	75	54	45	74	357
Roads decommissioned (miles) ...	0	1	0	0	0	1
Stream Habitat Restored or Enhanced (miles)	5	19	16	15	11	66
Terrestrial Habitat Restored or Enhanced (acres)	3,191	10,087	6,822	7,719	5,762	33,581
Timber Volume Sold (mmbf) ¹	15	22	23	20	25	106

¹ Official Timber Volume Sold by National Forest comes from official PTSAR (Periodic Timber Sale Attainment Reports) which provides volume in both hundred cubic feet (ccf)—converted here to million board feet (mmbf).

Question. How much in non-CFLR FS funds are used to meet matching requirements under CFLR? Please provide a breakdown by CFLR project.

Answer. The table below provides a list of CFLRP expenditures used to meet the matching requirement under CFLRP projects.

CFLRP EXPENDITURES AND FOREST SERVICE MATCHING FUNDS
(Forest Service matching funds are italicized)

The CFLR Fund (expenditures shown below) is to be used to pay up to 50 percent of the cost of carrying out and monitoring ecological restoration treatments on National Forest System land. The remainder of project implementation and monitoring costs are provided by Forest Service and partner match funding. Forest Service matching funds listed below include appropriated, permanent, and trust funds, as well as restoration treatments funded through timber value within a stewardship contract. It also includes unobligated balances that may be available in a given year to support the Chief's priorities and Strategic Plan. Forest Service match includes investments that would go to these landscapes even without the CFLR program, to support these high priority restoration efforts. Initial investments supported the projects as partner match and revenue from woody byproducts increase over time with implementation.

Project Name	Fiscal Year 2010 CFLRP & FS Match	Fiscal Year 2011 CFLRP & FS Match	Fiscal Year 2012 CFLRP & FS Match	Fiscal Year 2013 CFLRP & FS Match	Fiscal Year 2014 CFLRP & FS Match
Four Forest Restoration Initiative	\$985,943 <i>25,602,100</i>	\$1,377,483 <i>6,755,235</i>	\$2,010,741 <i>14,395,465</i>	\$3,890,185 <i>17,483,952</i>	\$3,718,311 <i>17,896,968</i>
Accelerating Longleaf Pine	1,000,313 <i>1,579,787</i>	1,164,031 <i>1,464,896</i>	1,408,354 <i>1,599,014</i>	979,898 <i>1,687,376</i>	984,542 <i>2,491,322</i>
Amador-Calaveras Cornerstone	0 0	0 0	658,373 <i>716,275</i>	620,770 <i>618,295</i>	930,857 <i>5,982,159</i>
Burney-Hat Creek Basins	0 0	0 0	512,691 0	200,864 <i>777,316</i>	934,763 <i>563,347</i>
Colorado Front Range	930,458 <i>1,100,763</i>	3,578,889 <i>1,436,804</i>	2,945,211 <i>1,968,824</i>	2,494,072 <i>2,902,453</i>	1,937,324 <i>4,412,522</i>
Deschutes Collaborative Forest	498,402 <i>2,506,679</i>	660,492 <i>627,886</i>	621,311 <i>1,251,485</i>	443,468 <i>1,297,611</i>	1,100,337 <i>1,863,306</i>

Project Name	Fiscal Year 2010 CFLRP & FS Match	Fiscal Year 2011 CFLRP & FS Match	Fiscal Year 2012 CFLRP & FS Match	Fiscal Year 2013 CFLRP & FS Match	Fiscal Year 2014 CFLRP & FS Match
Dinky Landscape Restoration	1,107,000 <i>305,919</i>	1,170,965 <i>688,878</i>	1,408,791 <i>820,427</i>	900,819 <i>1,631,206</i>	1,095,987 <i>1,566,590</i>
Grandfather Restoration	0 0	0 0	322,819 <i>185,878</i>	478,763 <i>2,224,737</i>	409,100 <i>320,009</i>
Kootenai Valley Resource Initiative	0 0	0 0	174,911 <i>352,801</i>	176,479 <i>630,107</i>	597,381 <i>1,511,209</i>
Lakeview Stewardship	0 0	0 0	2,088,646 <i>3,347,513</i>	2,037,204 <i>5,321,117</i>	2,707,036 <i>4,075,996</i>
Longleaf Pine ¹ 0 0 <i>4,193,690</i>	1,909,931 <i>1,646,194</i>	1,954,859 <i>3,333,200</i>
Missouri Pine-Oak Woodlands Restoration	0 0	0 0	534,966 <i>295,308</i>	531,335 <i>1,434,590</i>	786,272 <i>1,066,617</i>
Northeast Washington ¹ Forest Vision 2020	0 0	0 0	0 <i>1,523,557</i>	1,416,636 <i>1,783,510</i>	1,524,908 <i>1,503,150</i>
Ozark Highlands ¹ Ecosystem Restoration	0 0	0 0	0 <i>425,389</i>	1,371,740 <i>1,822,965</i>	1,349,323 <i>2,384,261</i>
Selway-Middle Fork	998,125 <i>352,145</i>	3,030,467 <i>1,595,149</i>	2,755,991 <i>1,579,612</i>	2,305,822 <i>2,708,049</i>	2,270,924 <i>2,653,263</i>
Shortleaf-Bluestem	0 0	0 0	316,319 <i>642,974</i>	1,739,957 <i>2,795,554</i>	1,382,163 <i>2,718,882</i>
Southern Blues Restoration Coalition	0 0	0 0	1,935,470 <i>1,595,247</i>	1,762,834 <i>4,205,990</i>	1,865,750 <i>3,069,395</i>
Southwest Jemez Mountains	341,414 <i>1,143,000</i>	976,477 <i>1,417,600</i>	1,256,857 <i>2,551,544</i>	1,997,544 <i>2,576,738</i>	1,948,378 <i>2,643,191</i>
Southwest Crown of the Continent	1,006,295 <i>1,833,459</i>	3,125,410 <i>2,720,673</i>	3,215,025 <i>2,376,974</i>	2,647,057 <i>3,653,125</i>	2,277,790 <i>2,486,289</i>
Tapash	1,346,196 <i>1,264,305</i>	803,182 <i>324,716</i>	881,714 <i>860,034</i>	1,454,042 <i>204,258</i>	1,710,488 <i>865,364</i>
Uncompahgre Plateau	438,178 <i>224,500</i>	863,892 <i>1,440,198</i>	733,237 <i>998,432</i>	504,996 <i>1,461,162</i>	741,551 <i>1,970,401</i>
Weiser-Little Salmon Headwaters	0 0	0 0	2,170,446 <i>4,058,114</i>	2,728,164 <i>4,505,261</i>	2,217,072 <i>10,442,104</i>
Zuni Mountain	0 0	0 0	329,311 <i>402,113</i>	559,502 <i>770,191</i>	358,020 <i>8,665,053</i>
Total ¹	7,546,431	16,751,288	26,281,184	33,152,082	32,865,811
<i>FS Total</i>	<i>35,912,657</i>	<i>18,472,035</i>	<i>47,099,673</i>	<i>64,141,776</i>	<i>85,743,775</i>

¹ Note: 10 projects were added to the CFLRP program in fiscal year 2012 and three more were added in fiscal year 2013. CFLN totals include *only expenditures*; they do not capture prior year CFLN funds which remain available. CFLN funds provide up to 50 percent of the project funding, supplemented by the matching funds, over the 10-year project lifetimes.

Question. In an answer to a question for the record from Energy and Natural Resources hearing in July of last year you stated that the Forest Service has identified approximately 11.3 million acres for highest priority treatment. You went on to say that these acres are at a high or very high risk and that treating these acres would greatly reduce the negative consequences of potential wildfires.

Where are these acres located?

Answer. The 11.3 million acres is an estimate based on a national scale analysis of fire potential that is regularly updated (annually or biennially) to incorporate landscape changes. These estimates reflect acres that are at high and very high risk of wildfire, are near human development or in high value municipal watersheds, not in wilderness or roadless areas, and in fire regime groups I, II, or III. The numbers

are constantly changing, as wildfires, land management, and development occur. Due to this, the analysis only readily generates data at the Regional level.

Forest Service Region	Priority Acres
1 Northern Region	1,443,000
2 Rocky Mountain Region	679,000
3 Southwestern Region	1,704,000
4 Intermountain Region	764,000
5 Pacific Southwest Region	3,698,000
6 Pacific Northwest Region	1,884,000
8 Southern Region	999,000
9 Eastern Region	137,000
Total Acres	11,308,000

Question. How many of these acres do you plan to treat in fiscal year 2015, and how many for fiscal year 2016 under this proposed budget?

Answer. The Forest Service expects to treat fuels on 2.145 million acres in 2015 and also in 2016. Much of this work will take place in the areas as identified above. Fuels work will also take place in areas that are high priority for integrated restoration objectives, or in areas where maintenance work is needed to protect previous landscape management investments (for example, maintenance burning in the Southeast). In addition, some areas require more than one treatment to effectively reduce risk or achieve restoration objectives.

Question. How are you tracking the Forest Service's progress on treating these 11.3 million acres? Is there a performance measure in this budget proposal?

Answer. Treated acres are tracked within an enterprise system, including their mapped locations. We are piloting a new performance measure for our draft Strategic Plan that better tracks risk reduced on National Forest System lands.

Alaska doesn't compete well for hazardous fuels funds, but that doesn't mean our need isn't significant. I am particularly concerned about this in the wake of the Funny River Fire. As you know, roughly 243 square miles burned in the fire, fueled largely by spruce bark beetle kills. We were fortunate that fuels breaks worked and helped keep the fire from being even more destructive. According to your statistics, Alaska received just \$785,000 in fiscal year 2014 and is on track to receive about the same amount for fiscal year 2015.

Question. Is this sufficient to meet the need in Alaska?

Answer. Alaska received an additional \$200,000 in fiscal year 2015 for the Chugach National Forest's All Hands work. We recognize the importance and impact of the Fuels Program in Alaska. Due to constrained budgets, we must prioritize areas with more frequent fires and greater population densities.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR TOM UDALL

Question. How important is the Disaster Cap Adjustment proposal to the administration's overall vision for reducing the threat of wildfires?

Answer. The Disaster Cap Adjustment proposal is very important to the administration's proposal for a new wildfire funding mechanism. The proposal would allow us to continue to manage most wildland fires as we currently do, but would treat those fires that are most destructive and most costly outside of our discretionary budget. Approximately 1 percent of fires result in about 30 percent of suppression costs, and this new wildfire funding mechanism would allow those fires to be considered natural disasters. The cost of fire management has grown from 13 percent of the agency's budget in the 1990s to over 50 percent in 2014. With constrained budgets, this has meant other programs have suffered diminished budgets.

There is no set of solutions that will definitively result in decreasing wildfire management costs because of factors outside of our control, such as expansion of the wildland urban interface, and climate change. Taking these most expensive fires out of our constrained, discretionary budget by changing the mechanism to fund wildfire suppression will alleviate the need to continue cutting budgets to non-fire programs and allow us to invest further in the restoration and active management programs that will improve the health and resilience of forests and grasslands, including making them more resistant to wildland fire.

I cannot overstate how much the Disaster Cap Adjustment proposal for fire would alleviate the problems created by fire transfer. It would eliminate the need to transfer funds from hazardous fuels reduction efforts, and other important natural re-

source management programs to cover firefighting costs. When funding is transferred from other programs to support fire suppression operations, these programs are unable to accomplish priority work and achieve the overall mission of the agency. This priority work often was intended to mitigate wildland fire hazards in future years. The ability of programs to achieve established targets is impacted and projects are often put on hold or cancelled. Programs that help prevent damaging fires in the future, like Hazardous Fuels reduction, Integrated Resource Restoration, and the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program are critically important to maintain forest and rangeland health and reduce the threat of wildfires.

Question. What are the management impacts that the Forest Service has experienced because of fire borrowing in previous years?

Answer. In years when the base appropriation for suppression is insufficient to cover the cost of fighting wildland fire, the agency has the authority to transfer funds from non-fire activities to suppression. These non-fire activities are often those that improve the health and resilience of our forested landscapes and thus mitigate the potential for fire in future years. These fire transfers, while they are generally reimbursed in subsequent appropriations, are highly disruptive to agency operations and hinder the Forest Service's capacity to effectively maintain and restore the Nation's forests and grasslands. The agency work must come to a halt in order to transfer funds and, although we may be able to do the work the following year with the reimbursed funds, there are costs related to the delay, the window for conducting that work may pass and other projects may become a priority, and we fall further behind as we can never recapture the lost season of work.

Question. Given that the Forest Service will always fight forest fires, what will happen to the rest of the Forest Service budget if Congress fails to approve the disaster cap and fails to end sequestration?

Answer. The increasing cost of fighting wildland fire has a negative and lasting impact on the Forest Service's non-fire, mission-critical activities. We anticipate that without the budget cap adjustment, and with continued sequestration, we could face significantly negative funding impacts to other Forest Service mission focus areas thereby reducing our ability to achieve programmatic objectives because of the need to transfer funds from hazardous fuels reduction and other important natural resource management programs to cover firefighting costs.

Question. Are the Forest Service's attorneys working with the Valles Caldera Trust to ensure that long-term agreements and contracts are not jeopardized by the management transfer to the National Park Service?

Answer. The Forest Service is working closely with the National Park Service and the Valles Caldera Trust to ensure that the transfer of long-term agreements and contracts are not jeopardized by the management transfer to the National Park Service.

Question. How will the Forest Service continue to manage the Southwest Jemez Mountains Landscape Restoration Project, now that a portion of the original project area and scope are not National Forest System lands?

Answer. In fiscal year 2015, the Forest Service is transferring funds to the National Park Service for restoration activities on the Valles Caldera National Preserve lands under the existing contract. The Santa Fe National Forest is committed to continuing to collaborate with the National Park Service to achieve the Southwest Jemez Mountains restoration goals.

Question. The Forest Service has used the Southwest Ecological Restoration Institute (SWERI) to assist in collecting data, researching solutions to problems, consulting on and assessing planned decisions, and to disseminate their findings. Despite the benefits to the Forest Service, funding for the Institute has stagnated over the last few years at \$1.5 million. Is this level of funding adequate for SWERI's work?

Answer. The current funding amount is consistent with the levels set by Congress when the Southwest Forest Health and Wildfire Prevention Act (which authorized funding to these Institutes) was passed. The amounts provided to each Institute are meant to align with their capacity and focus areas. They are valuable partners and play a critical role in the transfer of current scientific information regarding management of fire-adapted ecosystems in the interior West. The Forest Service has also provided additional funding to the Institutes through other partnerships and competitive processes. The Forest Service meets regularly with representatives from each Institute to discuss funding, upcoming work plans, and outyear planning. Our Southwest Region develops annual work plans for each Institute in consultation with the Department of the Interior and State Foresters.

Question. Within SWERI, both the New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute and the Colorado program receive substantially less each year than Arizona, despite the fact that the three programs submit a shared list of projects to

the Forest Service. It is my understanding that the institutes produce an annual work plan matching their \$1.5 million authorization delivered to the Forest Service before their funding is allocated. Is the funding for the three individual institutes based on their annual submissions of projects, or is it just based on historic levels and an archaic formula?

Answer. The fiscal year 2015 allocation was based on the distribution in the fiscal year 2008 Appropriations Bill, the last year in which allocations were specified by Congress: Northern Arizona University \$1,200,000 (80 percent); Colorado State University \$150,000 (10 percent); and New Mexico Highlands University \$150,000 (10 percent).

Question. What will the Forest Service do to provide additional financial resources for the New Mexico and Colorado programs that are a part of SWERI?

Answer. Over the years, the Forest Service has provided additional funding to the Institutes through other partnerships and competitive processes. The Forest Service meets regularly with representatives from each Institute to discuss funding, upcoming work plans, and outyear planning. Our Southwest Region develops annual work plans for each Institute in consultation with the Department of the Interior and State Foresters. We will continue to meet and engage in discussions about funding levels appropriate for each Institute's outyear work plans.

Question. The President's budget calls for an increase of \$20 million for the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program. What are the plans for the additional funding—will new projects be started, or is the increase to provide higher levels of funding to the existing projects?

Answer. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget would permit the investment in up to 10 new CFLRP projects. New CFLRP projects would be submitted by Forest Service Regions and reviewed by an Advisory Committee. As specified in the law, the Advisory Committee will then submit recommendations for funding projects to the Secretary of Agriculture, who will make a final decision regarding project selection.

Question. In fiscal year 2014, the Forest Service was provided with \$2 million for a Restoration Partnerships program to improve relations with utilities and increase non-Federal funding for fuels treatments. Why did the Forest Service not request specific funding for this program in fiscal year 2015 or fiscal year 2016, and what is the Forest Service doing to continue this type of activity without specific funding?

Answer. This budget item was not requested for fiscal year 2015 or fiscal year 2016 because similar activities will be carried out through partnerships under the proposed Integrated Resource Restoration budget line item.

Question. How is the Forest Service working with utilities to ensure that fires like the 2011 Las Conchas Fire in New Mexico, started by a downed power line, will not happen again?

Answer. Our Lands staff has been substantially engaged in this issue. We have worked closely with Edison Electric and our partner Federal land management agencies to draft revisions to a national MOU to facilitate cooperation and coordination with utilities regarding vegetation management on Federal lands, both inside and outside of their rights of ways. The parties have also engaged with the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies to understand how State entities can be more involved in vegetation management planning and control. We also meet regularly with utilities to identify any specific instances where they have been unable to complete required vegetation work, and send representatives to Western Governors Association and Western Utilities Group meetings (scheduled for May 2015) to discuss any adjustments to regulations, policies, or practices that facilitate cooperation in maintaining rights of way.

Question. In the case of the Las Conchas Fire, we have a situation where the Forest Service—an agency of the USDA—is suing a rural co-op, which is supported by USDA loan authority, over the downed power line that reportedly led to the fire. What is the Forest Service doing to avoid these fire starts—and subsequent expensive litigation—in the future?

Answer. We are developing a day-long workshop for agency leadership on energy development on National Forest System lands. This workshop will provide information on current and anticipated energy development project proposals and clarify the agency's role, responsibilities, and requirements to support energy demands in rural communities.

Question. In response to the endangered species listing of the New Mexico Meadow Jumping Mouse in June 2014, the Forest Service has since fenced off riparian areas to protect the mouse. This has upset local ranchers who have grazed in some of these areas for generations. What is the Forest Service doing to ensure ranchers are informed and have reasonable access?

Answer. The Forest Service is actively working with affected grazing permittees, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and other stakeholders on developing approaches to ensure the protection and recovery of the endangered New Mexico meadow jumping mouse while accommodating continued grazing. Affected permittees have been informed of the opportunity to participate in the consultation process with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service through applicant status, as well as the opportunity to participate in any NEPA processes, and multiple opportunities for face-to-face discussions on these issues.

In fiscal year 2014, the listing of the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse required the Forest Service to take immediate measures to protect occupied habitat which was not already within riparian enclosures. These enclosures allowed continued access to water for cattle and did not result in any reductions in permitted grazing numbers or change in permitted season of use. Of the 22 allotments with proposed critical habitat in New Mexico and Arizona, only two allotments required installation of temporary fencing, 13 already had permanent fencing in place, and the remaining allotments were either vacant, lacked occupied habitat, or were not scheduled for grazing after the listing. A relatively small percent of each allotment is within proposed critical habitat.

The final determination of any further protective measures or change in grazing management will depend upon pending consultation, final designation of critical habitat, and any required NEPA analysis. Further details are available on the Southwestern Regions Web site at <http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/r3/home/?cid=stelprd3809040>.

Question. Water is a big concern for New Mexicans and for Westerners generally. The severe drought in the Southwest weighs heavily on the shoulders of land and water managers and users in the region. What role does the Land and Water Conservation Fund play in helping to protect watersheds throughout the National Forest System?

Answer. The Land and Water Conservation Fund plays an important role in protecting intact, healthy watersheds, as well as lands in compromised watersheds that are good candidates for restoration to improve water quality and quantity. New Mexico has a great example—the Miranda Canyon acquisition recently completed on the Carson National Forest. Just over 5,000 acres of protected lands in the headwaters of the Rio Grande River as well as the entire Arroyo Miranda watershed were acquired, to protect watersheds throughout the National Forest System and to provide drinking water to local communities.

Question. In fiscal year 2014, the Forest Service proposed an increase of \$12 million for Research and Development, but in both the fiscal year 2015 budget and now the fiscal year 2016 budget, there is a \$17 million reduction. What will be the impacts of this overall reduction—and why this abrupt switch from proposed increases to decreases?

Answer. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget the Forest Service proposes \$291,982,000 for Research and Development (R&D), with \$83,000,000 for the Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program and \$208,510,000 for the other portions of R&D. This is an increase of \$13,000,000 for FIA and a decrease of \$17,000,000 for other R&D programs.

	Fiscal Year 2015 Enacted	Fiscal Year 2016 President's Budget	Change
Non-FIA programs	\$226,000,000	\$208,510,000	– \$17,018,000
FIA programs	70,000,000	83,000,000	+ 13,000,000
R&D Total	296,000,000	291,982,000	– 4,018,000

As the Nation's "Forest Census", FIA provides information on forest health today and how forests are likely to appear 10 to 50 years from now. FIA is foundational to restoration efforts on National Forest System lands as well as private forestland. The additional \$13,000,000 will provide for the first time inclusion of interior Alaska to the FIA program and improved measurements and research capacity, including the improved estimation of forest carbon inventory, land cover and timber products output.

The \$17 million proposed decrease to the non-FIA research portfolio will result in a loss of capacity to the non-FIA research programs. These proposed changes reflect the difficult choices made to support the priority of forest restoration work while providing for growing fire suppression costs and meeting deficit reduction goals.

Question. What will be the impacts of the proposed Research and Development budget cut on research into cost-effective biomass uses that could result in economic

benefits, such as the nanotechnology work occurring at the Forest Products Laboratory?

Answer. The fiscal year 2016 President's budget would fund continued research into cost-effective biomass uses; however, some research may need to be conducted at a slower pace.

Question. How does the Forest Service intend to maintain a focus on market development for biomass with this proposed cut in Research and Development?

Answer. Market expansion and development for high value, high volume biomass uses from low value wood would be funded by the Wildland Fire Management account. Specifically, hazardous fuels funds would be made available for market development through grants to States and funds for the Forest Products Marketing Unit (FPMU) at the Forest Products Laboratory.

Question. Recreation, Heritage and Wilderness is slated for a \$2.3 million increase in the fiscal year 2016 budget request. However, within the program, Recreation management is up \$3.7 million, Special Use Authorization administration is up \$2.3 million, and Wilderness/Wild & Scenic River management is cut by \$2.9 million. Why does Recreation need more vs. Wilderness in fiscal year 2016?

Answer. In fiscal year 2016, we propose to strengthen and enhance the public's connection with the outdoors through privately provided services, expanding citizen stewardship through partners and volunteer opportunities, and enhancing the quality and delivery of information to the public.

In fiscal year 2016, an increase in funds for Recreation Operations funds will support: (1) further engagement of youth, veterans, and underserved populations, via our partnerships through the 21st Century Conservation Service Corps (21CSC); and (2) delivery of accurate, real-time data on recreation opportunities to enable more efficient, mobile and consistent data management for use by the public as well as vendors.

The decrease in funding for Wilderness and Wild & Scenic Rivers program reflects both a reduction in funding associated with the completion of the 10-Year Wilderness Stewardship Challenge and our celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Wilderness Act. The budget proposes a shift in funds towards special use administration, 21CSC, and expanding our digital infrastructure by supporting a public-facing web portal for permit requests. These investments will support the more than 5,000 outfitters and guides whose livelihoods depend on our public lands and waters, including many that operate in and around Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL

Question. In 2004, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) adopted the Land Between the Lakes (LBL) Land and Resource Management Plan or the "Area Plan." This plan includes information pertaining to the land allocations (i.e. forest, open lands, recreation and environmental education), and strategies for supporting these designations, and other criteria to be used to maintain the Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area. After 10 years executing the Area Plan, visitors, residents, and others have noticed a recent uptick in logging and burning by the USFS at LBL, meanwhile other needed infrastructure and maintenance projects continue to go unaddressed by the USFS. These misplaced priorities have caused much concern among hunters, horsemen, hikers, residents, preservationists, and others that visit the park. It is my understanding that these constituents, as well as locally elected officials, have called on your agency to provide all management plans and financial documents relating to the Area Plan, and for the USFS to halt any logging and burning until this information is received and reviewed by the community, so that they may engage in a transparent and public dialogue with your agency.

Has your agency provided this information to the community to date and, if not, when does it intend to do so?

Answer. The Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area (LBL) is engaging the public in conversations to address these concerns. The first public meeting was held on April 28, 2015. Lyon County Judge-Executive Wade White requested and was sent information regarding public engagement in the development of the LBL Area Plan. The unit has also shared information on budget allocations for fiscal years 2013 through 2015.

Question. Do you intend to suspend logging and burning at LBL until you address the community's concerns regarding this matter?

Answer. The Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area Supervisor has committed to:

—delaying offering additional timber sales until the public could be engaged in a conversation about land management;

- addressing visual concerns on existing timber sales brought up by the public from the Trace Scenic Highway (existing timber sales will continue to operate per contract obligations), and
- starting a conversation with the public about land management.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

With that, we stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m., Wednesday, March 18, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]